96-99

OVERSIGHT HEARINGS ON THE 1980 CENSUS
PART XXI—NEW YORK, N.Y.

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
NINETY-SIXTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

NEWARK PUBL'C LIBRARY
DEC 18 1980
U. S. GOVT. PUBS.
DEPOSITORY 376

JUNE 7, 1980

Serial No. 96–99

Printed for the use of the
Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
88-912 O WASHINGTON: 1980

Y4.P84/10:

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

JAMES M. HANLEY, New York, *Chairman*
MORRIS K. UDALL, Arizona, *Vice Chairman*

CHARLES H. WILSON, California
WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
PATRICIA SCHROEDER, Colorado
GLADYS NOON SPELLMAN, Maryland
HERBERT E. HARRIS II, Virginia
ROBERT GARCIA, New York
MIKE LELAND, Texas
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
DONALD JOSEPH ALBOSTA, Michigan
JOHN J. CAVANAUGH, Nebraska
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio

EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Illinois
GENE TAYLOR, Missouri
BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
JIM LEACH, Iowa
TOM CORCORAN, Illinois
JAMES A. COURTER, New Jersey
CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR., California
WILLIAM E. DANNEMEYER, California
DANIEL B. CRANE, Illinois

DAVID MINTON, *Executive Director and General Counsel*
THEODORE J. KAZY, *Minority Staff Director*
ROBERT E. LOCKHART, *Deputy General Counsel*
JAMES PIERCE MYERS, *Assistant General Counsel*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION

ROBERT GARCIA, New York, *Chairman*

MICKEY LELAND, Texas
GERALDINE A. FERRARO, New York
GUS YATRON, Pennsylvania
MARY ROSE OAKAR, Ohio

JAMES A. COURTER, New Jersey
CHARLES PASHAYAN, JR., California
DANIEL B. CRANE, Illinois

MIKE FERRELL, *Subcommittee Staff Director*

CONTENTS

	Page
Statement of—	
Weiss, Hon. Ted, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	2
Murphy, Hon. John M., a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	5
Green, Hon. William, a Representative in Congress from the State of New York	10
Williams, Henry G., Office of the Lieutenant Governor, State of New York	13
Jones, David, assistant to the mayor of New York City	21
Shuman, George, postmaster, New York City Postal District	31
Hill, William F., regional director, Bureau of the Census	36
Rosenberg, Steven, former crewleader, Bureau of the Census	53
Landron, Angel	57
Serrano, Eli	57
Pinilla, Carmen	57
Talavera, Jose	57
Martin, Leon	57
Talavera, Jose	65
Massillon, Albert	68
Vignali, John	68
Barnwell, Aubrey	68
Hughes, James	68
Depesa, Frank	68
Communication from Vincent P. Barabba, Director, Bureau of the Census, transmitting response to subcommittee questions	78

THE 1980 CENSUS

SATURDAY, JUNE 7, 1980

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CENSUS AND POPULATION,
COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE,
New York, N.Y.

The subcommittee met at 9:30 a.m., in one of the hearing rooms at 26 Federal Plaza, Hon. Robert Garcia presiding.

Members present: William Green, James Scheuer, and Shirley Chisholm.

Staff present: Michael J. Ferrell and Naimah Rossant.

Chairman GARCIA. I would like to call this hearing to order.

This is a hearing on the census, with regards to the stage known as Follow-up One, where, enumerators are going out into the field to start picking up those persons who have not responded to the mail out.

The purpose of the hearing, frankly, is to make certain that in those areas of the city, where historically, we have always had problems enumerating, both in the 1960 and 1970 census, is enumerated properly. This time we're holding public hearings, and present are many of the persons directly involved, by that I mean the elected officials from various parts of the city of New York, and those persons who are working for the Bureau of the Census, the Administrators the district managers the people who are in the field, so that this subcommittee can get an actual sense and feel as to exactly what is going on.

The subcommittee has worked very hard in terms of making certain that the census has been publicized and that the importance of the census is well known.

In spite of all of that, we are still having serious problems in many parts of the city. It is to that I am directing this hearing, to make certain that we, as a subcommittee, can report to the Congress exactly what is happening, where the pitfalls are, and where we have had problems, hopefully we can make some corrections between now and the end of the actual census count itself, which is somewhere toward the end of 1980.

There is still time to make certain that those hard-to-enumerate persons are enumerated, this is the purpose and intent of what we are trying to accomplish here.

I am happy that we have three persons from the U.S. Congress here to testify and to report from their respective communities. We have Congress persons from Staten Island, from Manhattan, and I expect one or two will be arriving from Queens, and, of course, I am from the Bronx, which should give us a fairly good picture as

to how the elected officials are finding the census process, coupled with that, how we, as Congress persons, will be able to make whatever corrections we have to on the floor of Congress.

Now, I understand that Congress Ted Weiss, from Manhattan, will be the first witness to testify this morning.

Good morning, Congressman Weiss.

STATEMENT OF HON. TED WEISS

Congressman WEISS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At the outset, let me express my appreciation to you, as chairman of the Subcommittee on the Census and Population for arranging these hearings in New York City. I think the timing of the hearing is critical.

An accurate count in the 1980 census would be perhaps the most significant event for New York City in this decade.

Our representation in Congress and our share of Federal moneys from programs such as general revenue sharing and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA), among others, are based to different extents on census results. As a Representative from the 20th Congressional District, I have found serious defects in the 1980 census procedures. It now seems inevitable that New York City will be poorly served by the census.

This hearing is an extremely important step pinpointing the deficiencies in the census before its conclusion. It is not too late to correct this year's operation and improve the 1990 edition.

An underlying problem in the current census stems from one of the Bureau's first steps, the compilation of addresses and household lists.

The Bureau here in New York City began with addresses from purchased commercial lists. Information from the 1970 census was combined with these lists, and post office lists were used to cross-check.

I question the use of commercial lists as such a major factor in determining the number of households per census district. What interest would commercial list companies, not based in our communities, have in identifying the poor and minorities of our neighborhoods?

Commercial mailers seeking to facilitate sales of retail products obviously will be more interested in accurate lists of affluent areas than impoverished sections.

John Valentine, president of a company which provided mailing lists for the 1980 census, has told this subcommittee that such lists are not designed for effective use in areas of "high or dense poverty."

His company has not mailed into the South Bronx, for example, in 10 years, he noted.

Instead of spending taxpayers' money on commercial lists, I would assume that local post offices could make available their lists of households on mail routes as a primary source for the Census Bureau.

A second major, and common, problem is undercounting.

There are many groups of constituents I am afraid will not be counted in this year's census. As in many other urban areas, residents of poor areas will be missed too often.

Use of conventional, face-to-face enumeration would lead to more accurate results in such areas and among minority populations than the mass mailing procedure used this year.

Unfortunately, the Census Bureau decided this year to use personal enumeration only in relatively unpopulated areas. Ironically, commercial mailing lists are more useful in rural areas than cities.

I support the subcommittee's suggestion, as noted in its draft report, that mail carriers be used as enumerators during the census, not just as followup checkers. Carriers' knowledge of, and acceptance in, their route areas would be of great help.

Another group that stands to be undercounted in my district is the residents of the many residential hotels on the West Side who were not sent census forms at the end of March. Though the hotels will be visited by enumerators, it appears likely that a specific percentage of their residents will never be included in the count.

I question the counting of these hotels, where most inhabitants live in small apartments, in a manner separate from the bulk of the population.

In addition, residents of single room occupancy, SRO, hotels were not included in the late March mailing. SRO residents often have severe social problems which are dealt with, in part, through Federal service programs. Mailing of census forms to these residents would produce a lower return than from other citizens, but we have given enumerators a significant head start.

If undercounted, these residents stand to lose part of the services which constitute their lifelines.

One other severely undercounted group in the 20th Congressional District will be college student constituents who attend schools not located within the district. Many of my colleagues have previously expressed their concern that the Census Bureau chose to count these students as members of the college communities and not as members of the communities in which they are permanent residents and pay taxes.

The enormous outflow of students to schools around the country from the 20th Congressional District insures it will also be underrepresented in this way.

Census procedures have not responded to the needs of minority communities. The Bureau did not develop a Spanish language test for enumerators until several months after the district offices opened and only after much pressure from community groups and Hispanic organizations.

The district also has sizable minority populations of Greeks, Ukrainians, Chinese, and others, although blacks and Hispanics are the largest minorities in the area. The census forms—both long and short—were too complex for many citizens, but they were nearly impossible to complete for the thousands of Americans for whom English is a second language.

A two-part count, as suggested first by the General Accounting Office, would help alleviate this problem. A simple, very brief first mail form could count the population's number, and a second, more detailed form could address population and housing characteristics.

The raw count of our Nation's residents is the paramount goal, as your draft report notes.

Hiring of professional mass-mailing experts who could help select the most efficient procedure should also be considered.

Attention has recently been focused on the shortage of enumerators here. I would like to point out that the shortage is due to hiring delays within the Census Bureau offices, not any shortage of applicants. Delays up to 2 months have come between the time an applicant takes the test and is notified for employment, leading frustrated applicants to take other jobs. This problem must be corrected promptly.

Another delay reported to my office involves census paychecks. Employees have had to wait a minimum of 3 weeks and up to 6 weeks in several cases.

An undercount—particularly in poor and minority communities—appears likely this year. Accordingly, I support the subcommittee's recommendation to compensate for the undercount, using the Census Bureau's own studies of every population group's number and past undercount.

I understand the inherent bureaucratic problems of a large agency like the Census Bureau. However, I remain extremely concerned about the accuracy of the 1980 census.

It is absolutely essential that we all work together to improve the effectiveness of the current census in its remaining months. After 200 years, this job ought to be done right.

Thank you very much.

Chairman GARCIA. Thank you very much Congressman Weiss.

There are a couple of questions I would like to ask you.

You mentioned before, and then you went into some of the areas about the serious defects.

Congressman WEISS. Right.

Chairman GARCIA. You specified some. Is that the extent of the serious defects?

Congressman WEISS. Those are the problems, but they are very, very large. We are filled with resident hotels and single-room occupancy, and we are attempting in our own way, through the political people, and the civic organizations, to try to give the Census Bureau a better handle, but as things stand now, there is going to be just a very, very vast undercount.

Chairman GARCIA. Are you getting the type of cooperation that is necessary? First of all, Congressman Weiss, how many census officers do you have in the West Side?

Congressman WEISS. There are two that we are directly involved with.

Chairman GARCIA. Two within the confines of your congressional district?

Congressman WEISS. One is in Upper Manhattan. There is a third that we have a part of, but we don't get involved with.

Chairman GARCIA. Of the two offices in your district, which one is calling up with more problems, the one in the north, or the one in the south?

Congressman WEISS. There are different problems. The one in the north really has, I think, much more of a problem with——

Chairman GARCIA. The reasons why I ask Congressman, is because in the north, your ethnicity starts.

Congressman WEISS. The northern office has much more of a language problem, and the southern part has much more of a difficulty with the presence of the resident hotels and SRO's, whose people are not being counted. In each instance, there is going to be severe undercounting.

Chairman GARCIA. How is the counting done at Columbia University?

Congressman WEISS. We don't have any information, but it also is not in our area, that is—it is somebody else's job. That is part of Congressman Rangel's district.

Chairman GARCIA. Several Members of Congress have been invited, and others joining us, but one of the things that we hope to get out of this hearing, because New York City has always been undercounted, is that we, as elected officials from the city of New York have the responsibility of voicing our undercount problems. I would hope that you and Congressman Murphy and Congressman Green would be able to as we finish this hearing, in some way, try and get that message to the counties that we, in the city of New York, are being severely undercounted, and that we have some problems, and we want them addressed. It is a mounting of pressure that we need to place on the Bureau of the Census to make certain that there are adjustments made, or additional time given for local review, that every consideration be given to the city of New York in terms of the 1980 Census.

Congressman WEISS. Can you imagine how difficult it would be if you were not holding the position you do. We look to you for your leadership, and we will be pleased to follow and work with you in whatever way we can.

Chairman GARCIA. Thank you so much for being with us.

The next person who are going to hear from is Congressman Jack Murphy of Staten Island-Manhattan. Congressman William Green will follow him, after which Congressman Green will then join us as part of our panel.

I would like to say, before we start, we held four or five hearings in the city of New York, one of them was in Congressman Murphy's district in Chinatown, and I think it was probably the first hearing ever held dealing with the census in that community. The one thing that Congressman Murphy made very clear to me was that, we talk about minorities and problems concerning minorities, but very seldom are the Asians included, the Chinese specifically. So at his insistence we held a hearing in Chinatown.

I thought it was a very fruitful hearing.

Congressman Murphy.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

Congressman MURPHY. Chairman Garcia, I appreciate your invitation to testify today before your Subcommittee on Census and Population to discuss the problems that surfaced, and which we are still encountering regarding the achievement of an accurate count in the 1980 Census.

68-912 O - 80 - 2

A little less than 6 months ago, on November 16, 1979, to be exact, you and I sat in the auditorium of P.S. 124, a school not far from here, and I listened for several hours while members of our community presented suggestions for perfecting the census procedure, and representatives of the Census Bureau explained how they were going to avert an undercount.

I appreciated your cooperation in holding a hearing in Chinatown to highlight the census, and at the time was hopeful that the publicity and dialogs generated by this public forum would enhance our complete count goal. Events since April 1 have shown that our worst fears rather than our highest hopes have been realized.

The census, both nationwide and in New York City, have been plagued by internal and external problems which have caused confusion, inefficiency, and will result in an undercount which will cost this city dearly in terms of Federal dollars and representation in the legislatures.

The specific problems encountered within my congressional district began with the building selected to house the census office.

A lease was signed to rent space on the seventh floor of an old factory undergoing renovations on Staten Island. This was possibly the most inappropriate place to house this operation that could be found.

The building is virtually vacant, with the exception of numerous pigeons and other forms of wild life which fly freely throughout.

Hundreds of barrels of chemicals are in storage throughout the building which has no smoke detectors and which has suffered two fires since the first of the year.

The single passenger elevator in the building is frequently malfunctioning and several census workers have been trapped in it for periods of up to 20 minutes. There is no alarm in the elevator.

One young woman suffered a serious sprain to her arm when she was forced to walk up the stairs, which are unlighted, when the elevator was inoperative.

The one large single room which served as offices for the entire census operation has one heating vent in the middle of the room which pointed straight down, until a deflector was installed. Several times employees had to be sent home because the room was so cold as to make it impossible to work.

These conditions are in addition to leaky pipes, fire exists which were partially obstructed, the postal service being unwilling to deliver mail to the office, and the fact that the building lacked a certificate of occupancy.

For these accommodations, the Government paid a reported $110,000 which did not cover night work done in the office for which the Census Bureau was billed an additional $90 per night.

You cannot tell me that more suitable arrangements could not have been made. There are several other commercial possibilities as well as the opportunity to locate the office at Fort Wadsworth on Staten Island. This latter option received cursory attention by census, but was never followed up through the appropriate channels.

The threat to their safety has impacted employee morale, their longevity in the job, and recruiting efforts. All of these factors have also been aggravated by the pay scale enforced in this office.

The employees of the Staten Island office are responsible for not only Staten Island, but for parts of Brooklyn as well. It was estimated that this area would encompass 122,000 housing units in Brooklyn and 98,000 in Staten Island. An additional 28,000 to 29,000 units were found on Staten Island during the pre-canvass making this one of the largest districts in the New York region.

This District was considered a decentralized office which means essentially that it was not expected to have to deal with a high population density. Because of the designation, the employees of this office were paid substantially less than their colleagues in centralized offices.

For example, a crew leader in a centralized office makes $5.10 per hour, in a decentralized office, he makes $4.50, and these comparisons carry through at every level.

Perhaps the most glaring example is the wages of an office operations supervisor; in a centralized office he would make $8.75 per hour, and in Staten Island he would make $6.85 per hour.

This amounts to approximately $75 per week and hundreds of dollars per month.

You could imagine the impact this has had on recruiting and keeping good people. The Staten Island office should have, at this moment, 540 enumerators working fulltime, instead, it has 173.

Obviously, necessary work is not getting done.

While these personnel problems I have described may not seem important in the context of the entire census operation, I can assure you that they are.

Working conditions play an integral part in the quality of work an employee can produce, and it is this product that will spell the difference between New York City receiving it's fair share of the Federal budget or something less.

Aside from these internal difficulties, the census office in my area has had to overcome inaccurate and incorrect address registries—as I pointed out earlier, approximately 30,000 housing units were "discovered" in State Island alone during the pre-canvass, a postal service in Brooklyn which was very uncooperative—in several instances, census forms were merely left in the lobbies of apartment buildings rather than being distributed to each mailbox and divisions of authority which made it next to impossible to terminate workers who were not pulling their weight.

While it is impossible to use the mail return rate as an overall indication of the success of the census operation, it certainly is a valid criteria for inclusion in our assessment.

Staten Islanders return their forms at an 82 percent or an 83 percent rate; in Brooklyn it was more like 60 percent, which I understand is about the city average, although no one who knows will verify this.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday I received a copy of a letter Mayor Koch has sent to the Director of the census, Vincent Barabba, spelling out specific problems and requests the city would like addressed. I would like to include this letter in the record of this hearing and will provide you with a copy of it.

The mayor's letter covers the concerns of the entire city. I have tried to point out specific problems which were encountered in the areas I represent.

The common experience both specifically and throughout the city should alarm us all. We were assured before the census began that every step was being taken to insure a complete count, but, as it turns out, we will do no better this year than the last time out.

It is not too late to salvage a more accurate census. If the requests outlined in the mayor's letter to the Census Bureau are acted upon immediately, we can expect some relief.

I support the mayor in this endeavor and will do what I can to insure that the Census Bureau moves on his recommendations.

This city cannot stand to lose the millions of dollars an incomplete count will mean. Nor can we afford to allow ourselves to be underrepresented in the House of Representatives and the State legislature.

These are matters which concern me and everyone in this room.

I appreciate the subcommittee's diligence in overseeing the census and for providing us this forum today.

Perhaps if our New York delegation requires that the Census Bureau come over and give us a report based on the General Accounting Office study and our own study in our own districts and areas in the next several weeks, we can ask point blank just what concrete answers this census is going to give to the mayor's letter and recommendations on our own. The city cannot stand to lose the millions of dollars an incomplete count will mean.

I appreciate your diligence in overseeing the census, and for providing us this forum today.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Murphy, thank you very much.

On the last point, you talked about getting the Director of the census, Vincent Barabba, to come before the New York delegation. I think that is a good idea, and seeing that we do have our weekly New York delegation luncheons, with both the full State delegation, as well as the Democratic delegation of the State, I think it may be a good idea to send a letter to Mr. Barabba to invite him to come before us at a luncheon, to discuss with us exactly where we are in terms of the Census.

I will try to do that within the next couple of weeks.

Let me ask you a question.

How many people to your knowledge, have left the Census Bureau, just quit? Has there been a big turnover in Staten Island and lower Manhattan?

Congressman MURPHY. There has been a big turnover at all levels. There has been an internecine warfare on a personality and political basis within supervisory echelons of the census, that has caused disruption, slowdowns and obviously affects the entire count. I will provide for the record of this committee a report giving you as accurate a set of numbers and statistics as I can.

Chairman GARCIA. We have invited people here who have been working with the census since the beginning of the year, some have left the census, some are still on the census payrolls, to get some idea as to what they actually are going through in the field. I think that this also would be part of our ongoing conversation with the Bureau of the Census, as to the quality of enumeration, which, to me, is very important.

Mr. Ferrell, is there any question that you would like to ask?

Congressman MURPHY. I personally have had a minimum of three meetings with census officials at the very outset to try and forestall the types of problems that have developed. Having had experience with the census on other occasions, and seeing what the problems were, I understood the effect that a drastic undercount would have. From the preliminary inquiries that I made, I see a very drastic undercount coming in the areas that I represent, as opposed to the figures that I have gotten from the postal department, as well as the sanitation department, that have daily contact with members of households, through mail deliveries, and have an understanding on a daily basis of the neighborhoods we are talking about.

Mr. FERRELL. What has been the Bureau's response to these issues that you have brought to their attention?

Congressman MURPHY. Well, as far as the——

Mr. FERRELL. You talked about the warfare in the offices.

Congressman MURPHY. As far as the structure is concerned, finally, Mr. Hill did come down, and the person who had the building was required to make some changes, but you cannot make a silk purse out of a sow's ear, and that particular building was almost—any rational observer would realize that putting these hundreds of people on the seventh floor of a factory building, in an isolated area, certainly was not in the interest of an efficient census.

Mr. FERRELL. Were you consulted about that?

Congressman MURPHY. I had advised against it. Here we had Fort Wadsworth with open space, now boarded up, not in use, which would have been prime space, that the Department of the Interior is going to move many offices into as soon as it takes title in a few weeks.

It would have been the best of all possible worlds. Of course, it was on a competitive bid basis, and there was certain restrictions on the census, but I still think the census should have rejected this structure.

But then the question of personnel arises.

The professional director of the census in this area, of course, resigned. I don't know whether he will be here today as a witness, but I think maybe you ought to find out some of the reasons for his resigning at the outset.

Chairman GARCIA. He is in the audience, and I don't know if he is on the list to testify.

Congressman MURPHY. Well, certainly he was an experienced and able executive, and we were sorry to see him leave at the time.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me seize the opportunity to say that the relationship I had with the former Regional Director of the census in this region was excellent, and that he was extremely cooperative at all times.

Mr. FERRELL. There were people in the district office, or on the staff, or someone that prepared a more detailed listing of the problems?

Congressman MURPHY. I will give you specific numbers and facts.

Mr. FERRELL. One last question.

From a delegation standpoint, what do you think the delegation should propose to the Census Bureau to correct problems we have heard about in your district and Mr. Weiss' district?

Congressman MURPHY. I think we should start as a basis with the mayor's recommendations. Of course, he wants a full explanation as to the accuracy and currency of the address registers.

These are the basic premises, and I think Congressman Weiss just testified as to the fact that in many areas, which are not prime market areas, the addresses are not used frequently.

Chronic understaffing of the census district offices is also a problem.

Hiring and training of enumerators in areas of low rates of mail returns is also a problem.

Congressman Weiss addressed himself to that as well.

The other recommendations of the mayor should certainly be the base, and, of course, what the results of this hearing are should follow up on that.

Mr. FERRELL. Thank you.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Murphy, thank you very much.

Our next speaker will be Congressman William Green.

Congressman Green represents one of the more affluent areas of our city, but even an area such as that, where the community is not a transient one, as is the South Bronx, or other areas, there were many buildings which just never received forms. I remember Bill Green stating that to the committee, and I am hopeful that during the course of the testimony we will find out where we are with some of those buildings, and if anything has been corrected.

Congressman Green.

STATEMENT OF HON. WILLIAM GREEN

Congressman GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to express my appreciation to you for convening this hearing today.

You have convened many others throughout the country in order to try to make sure that Congress will have a firm grasp on what is going on in the census process.

I would like to offer as my testimony to help your subcommittee my own experience with the workings of the census in Manhattan over the past 6 months.

In January, as you remember, the census reported that its trial count of last September in lower Manhattan, the area from Houston Street to the Battery, showed a decline of population.

I was very surprised at this, because, from my former work as Regional Administrator of HUD here in New York, I was aware of substantial new housing built there in the last decade, including the Independence Plaza complex, the Confucius Plaza complex, and Southbridge Houses, with over 3,500 new apartments.

I was also aware, as I am sure you are, of the continuing immigration of people from China into the lower Manhattan area and, indeed, the serious community confrontations that were occurring as that very densely packed population was spreading into other ethnic neighborhoods in the immediate area.

Again, as I am sure you are also aware, there have been very substantial conversions of former commercial space, principally lofts, into housing units, notably in the Soho area.

I reported my suspicion of an undercount to Vincent Barabba, the Director of the Bureau of the Census, and he wrote in return assuring me that all would be well for the full count at the end of March.

I was not quite as confident as he. So I mailed over 150,000 pieces

of literature into my district, alerting residents to the upcoming census, in the hope that they would complain if they were missed.

Fortunately, many of them did.

In early April, my office received a number of calls from residents saying that they had not received the census form. In each case, my office, using a street address telephone directory, made calls to other residents of the same buildings from which these complaints had emanated, and we located more than two dozen structures holding more than 2,500 apartments where not one form had been received.

This I want you to understand was based strictly on complaints, so I don't pretend that it is a full catalog of that problem.

As many, though not all, of the missed buildings, were relatively new or were conversions, we suspected that the census mailing list was outdated. We consulted with the city planning department, and they, too, had apparently reached the same conclusion, because they had found numerous oversights relating to individual apartment units converted from storage or commercial space.

I was told also by them, that in many cases where there had been street name changes dating back many years, the Census Bureau had still used the old street names, which resulted in the forms not being delivered.

Unfortunately, the Census Bureau has not been willing to allow New York City to examine the Bureau's mailing lists to check for errors and oversights, according to the information that the city planning department gave me.

I have also been told by the post office that its original attempt to update and correct the Bureau's address lists was apparently ignored, as corrections through what it calls blue cards had to be made repeatedly. I assume the city's postmaster, George Shuman, who is on your list of witnesses, will have more to say on that point.

When I wrote to Mr. Barabba a second time expressing my concern about the count throughout our city, he responded with assurances that all oversights would be picked up primarily through the enumeration system of door-to-door checkups.

Unfortunately, conversations and meetings I have had with census workers—I understand that you have on your witness list census personnel that I had conversed with on this—suggested that this system, too, is floundering because of the difficulty in hiring and retaining staff.

I have suggested that changes be made, and I hope that the census officials here today will report some action in that area. Yet, I confess I cannot feel secure that the enumerators will be able to locate and identify the missing. For one thing, unless we can check the Bureau's mailing list, not names or confidential information, just mailing addresses, we cannot know what buildings and what apartments have been overlooked.

The Bureau has been patting itself on the back for doing what it calls a good job nationally, but I must say, based on my experience, that in New York City, the count is very questionable.

We cannot afford the loss of Federal money and representation that would accompany an undercount.

New Yorkers send too much money to Washington to be cheated out of proper service by a Federal agency, and not have their fair share

of money being returned to State and local governments. I know the Bureau is anxious to get its work finished and its report to the President and to the Congress.

But the Bureau already eliminated an important local review of the census to save time. We cannot allow any more shortcuts, and we cannot allow ourselves to be cheated.

Thank you.

Chairman GARCIA. Thank you, Congressman Green.

I would like to say that your timetable for background is well put together, and pinpoints many specifics.

That will be, with your permission, entered into the record so that it will accompany your testimony.

Congressman GREEN. By all means.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Green, at the very beginning, on or about April 1, I remember reading in the newspaper, I think a reporter with the Times—a young woman by the name of Robin Herman—wrote that there were entire buildings, where there were no census forms mailed.

Has that been taken care of?

Congressman GREEN. My understanding is that as we reported buildings to the Census Bureau, we tested them afterward, and we understand that the forms did get mailed out to them. But as I indicated to you, my knowledge of which buildings did not receive forms is only by reason of there being a complaint from that building, and then my following up or my staff following up, using the street address telephone directory in order to determine that other tenants in that building had not gotten their forms.

Now, you have to understand that as a simple statistical proposition, by and large, it has been large buildings we have located.

How many walkups with 15 or 20 apartments I never got a complaint from, and therefore, never had a chance to follow up on, I simply do not know.

But there are a lot of those buildings, such as Congressman Weiss mentioned. I have a large number of single room occupancy buildings, I have the men's shelter on the Lower East Side, where there is a transient population, probably a unique situation.

I also have an area on the Lower East Side which is like the South Bronx, with a heavy abandonment problem, but not so wide, and with people drifting in and out of there. I have no handle on how that got done, although I have had complaints from one or two of the single room occupancy hotels that they were not counted.

Chairman GARCIA. I feel that is probably between 96th Street and 23rd Streets, north and south, and from the river over to 5th.

Congressman GREEN. Actually, 8th Avenue.

Chairman GARCIA. I'm just saying in terms of that specific area, which I consider to be among the most affluent areas in the country, if that area is not being serviced by the census, as I said before, that is an area that is pretty stable, what is happening in our more transient areas?

Congressman GREEN. I think we have had another problem in that area, and maybe further witnesses will be able to give you more information on it.

Obviously, the level of pay, which Congressman Murphy already mentioned, is not teremendously attractive in an affluent area, and as a result, I gather from speaking to crew chiefs in the area that there have been great difficulties in getting enumerators. The Census Bureau started out with the proposition that it made sense that they would use people from the neighborhood to do the enumeration.

I understand the philosophy behind that, and, it makes sense in many neighborhoods. But it seems to me that they waited awfully long in terms of hiring people who are not from the neighborhood that were needed to do that enumeration. I had crew chiefs telling me they are supposed to have 10 people, and the most they and many others had were 3 people.

Mr. FERRELL. You are saying that quite a few of the enumerators were not making the posted wage; is that what you are saying?

Congressman GREEN. The chairman was making the point that if there is an undercount problem in an affluent area, how much worse can it be elsewhere?

I was making a point that in an affluent area, they have one peculiar problem, namely, that the salaries or wages for enumerators were less likely to attract people, and there were great difficulties, according to crew chiefs, in getting sufficient crews of enumerators.

Mr. FERRELL. Just very quickly, in your letter of February 20, to the Bureau Director, you cited problems in the trial census in lower Manhattan.

Congressman GREEN. Yes.

Mr. FERRELL. How does that compare with some of the complaints that you have heard since April 1? Have they been remedied?

Congressman GREEN. That trial census was conducted in an area south of my district, in Congressman Murphy's district, so that I am not able to match them up perfectly. But obviously, you do have a situation with new Government projects, and you do have a situation with large numbers of conversions of commercial buildings, and that, to some degree, overlaps with the kind of problem I discovered in my district in buildings that were recently converted and new buildings that had not been picked up by the Census Bureau mailing lists.

That was not all the ones they missed, but that was a high proportion of them.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Green, thank you very much, and we would be delighted if you would join us on the panel.

Our next witness is Mr. Henry G. Williams, director of the statewide program for the Office of the Lieutenant Governor.

Mr. Williams, you can proceed.

STATEMENT OF HENRY G. WILLIAMS, DIRECTOR OF STATE-WIDE STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS, OFFICE OF THE LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Congressman Green.

As you know, Lieutenant Governor Cuomo could not be with you this morning because of an important family event in which he is engaged, and he asked me to give you his apologies and greetings.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the Lieutenant Governor's views on the progress of the 1980 Census in New York State. I am

68-912 O - 80 - 3

presenting this statement in my capacity as Governor Carey's designated chairman of the New York State Complete Count Committee.

More than 1 year ago, in May of 1979, I submitted remarks to your Subcommittee on Census and Population. At that time, I shared with you my concern that the 1980 census could mean the difference between life and death for many of New York State's communities because these communities depend heavily upon Federal aid to help pay the costs of essential services.

Since many Federal-aid programs are linked to the decennial census, an undercount of the 1980 census could mean a disastrous reduction in the amount of Federal aid our communities will receive.

Last year, I also suggested some steps which might be taken to help minimize the danger of an undercount in complex metropolitan areas like New York City, and I outlined a procedure which might be used to provide relief to communities where the undercount problem was severe.

I regret to say that the fears I presented to your subcommittee more than a year ago appear to have been confirmed.

In New York City, and in some sections of our other major urban centers, numerous problems have been reported in the distribution and response to census forms. Accordingly, it is reasonable to anticipate that the undercount which many observers have been predicting will, indeed, be the result of the 1980 census in New York.

Today, I want to make a point that, despite our substantial efforts to help assure a complete count, problems have occurred in the administration and conduct of the 1980 census, with the result that a substantial undercount may be expected.

First, let me briefly review some the actions we have taken to minimize the likelihood of an undercount.

Of course, the efforts and resources of the State government have been matched by the outstanding contributions of our local governments, such as New York City's substantial work, churches, neighborhood groups and voluntary organizations, labor unions, business and industry and many private citizens.

Even before Governor Carey established the State complete count committee, our agencies had been working with census officials in the preparation of maps and reviewing various aspects of planning for the census. The State complete count committee was set up to help spur the creation of community-based census organizations and to promote the cooperation of all New Yorkers in the complete count effort.

The committee is comprised of persons who are associated with church groups, labor, business, civic organizations and others. We provided detailed information to members of the committee so they could encourage their constituents to participate in the census.

Some examples of the work of members of our State Complete Count Committee are the following:

(1) Aid stations were set up in districts where enumeration problems were severe (i.e., large numbers of undocumented people, transients, runaways).

(2) Several members of the committee spoke on radio and TV about the census and the importance of being counted;

(3) Literature was distributed and posters were displayed in districts where relatively high undercounts were expected;

(4) Training sessions for volunteers were organized and conducted.

All together, the 68 members of the State complete count committee worked hard in their efforts to reach out to all residents, and encourage them to respond promptly to the census.

The complete count committee also works closely with the Governor's Office of Development Planning which coordinated the activities of State agencies in the complete count task. State agencies distributed more than 6 million pieces of literature about the census. The State education department, for example, distributed census brochures in eight languages, including many which Congressman Murphy referred to earlier this morning.

Public service announcements about the census were prepared by the complete count committee and by the Governor. These announcements were shown or played 2,429 times on 26 radio stations and 18 TV outlets throughout the State. These announcements were in addition, of course to the "You Can Count On Me" spots prepared for national distribution.

To further bolster our complete count efforts, Governor Carey allocated $700,000 from the Governor's special grant to operate a CETA census support program.

The funds are being used to employ 96 workers in urban areas across the State to aid in door-to-door followup in areas where the mail back of census forms has been low, and to help in postcensus local review of population and head counts.

These will be particularly helpful in Spanish-speaking areas and other sections where a significant portion of the population speaks languages such as Arabic, Chinese, Haitian, Hebrew, or Italian because many of the CETA aides are bilinqual.

The State's census support program will continue to provide staff assistance to local review boards throughout the review period at least until late August.

All of these actions—and I re-emphasize that the State's activities have been matched by local complete count committees—demonstrate that we have tried hard to minimize the possibility of an undercount.

Earlier this year, on April 8, I wrote to Vincent Barabba, the Director of the census to call his attention to certain problems which threatened the success of our complete count efforts.

The problems I specified were the following:

(1) Insufficient enumerators in New York City.

(*a*) Additional promotional work and funds were needed to attract people to serve as enumerators.

(*b*) The test to qualify enumerators should be conducted in Spanish, as well as in English.

(*c*) The passing grade for enumerators should be reduced in order to enlist more of them.

(*d*) Voluntary nonprofit and municipal workers should be used.

Parenthetically, these problems I note are very similar to those which are included in Mayor Koch's June 2, letter to the Director.

(2) Availability of block count data:

(*a*) Less than 1 month before the census was conducted on April 1, the Bureau of the Census informed the Governor that localities would have the opportunity for only a single review of the population and

housing counts, rather than having a chance to review master address registers in advance.

(*b*) Local review will be more difficult because localities will have access to the data only by enumeration district, rather than by block.

(*c*) The time period for local review should be extended from 10 days to 30 days; and census district offices should remain open for a sufficient length of time to enable localities to complete local review of census data.

The response of the Bureau of the Census to these problems has been inadequate.

Aside from modest efforts to recruit more enumerators, the Census Bureau has failed to address the key problems, thereby virtually insuring an undercount in New York City and perhaps in our other large cities as well.

In our small towns and rural areas, the census has been progressing satisfactorily.

Although I could say, Mr. Chairman, parenthetically, that I have correspondence, and have spoken just in the past couple of days with some of the people in our rural areas, where problems exist, as well, and I can assure you that people are not being paid in Albany and other points west just as they are not being paid in New York City.

I can assure you some enumerators are frustrated and demoralized in their efforts to work effectively in our rural areas because of the rates of pay they received, such as a mileage allowance which was not raised until recently.

Nevertheless, recent figures released by the Bureau of the Census show that upstate New York has been leading the New England census region in the rate of mail back response. This confirms that our State complete count efforts have been effective; and it suggests that the Bureau of the Census's overall strategy is geared to smaller urban places and suburban areas rather than to big cities.

I believe that the mail back response—and probably the final count as well—in New York City will confirm the worst: Large numbers of people, particularly Hispanics and black Americans will be missed.

It did not have to be like this!

The leaders of our large urban places have been citing special procedures and tactics which would be needed to avoid serious undercounts. The Bureau of the Census, however, has virtually ignored all of the signals and storm warnings.

While New York City is in a special class because it is more complex in size and demographic diversity than any other American city, New York is not alone among the big cities which are reporting census problems.

Chicago and Los Angeles have reported that master address registers have been confused; just as New York's has been.

Census forms were dumped in piles at apartment complexes in Detroit; just as occurred in New York.

The mayors of Atlanta, Phoenix, and Boston have complained that the 10-day local review period is too short; just as New York is complaining. Each one of these problems reflects the failure of the Bureau of the Census to recognize the special characteristics of our major urban places, and to devise procedures which would be adequate to

perform the 1980 census in a satisfactory manner. Now, we are faced with another, and perhaps even more vexing, challenge.

We must develop ways to ease the pain which an undercount means in our Federal system; that is, loss of representation and loss of dollars.

We should proceed on two fronts.

First, develop evidence to insure that the final count figure accurately reflects New York's population.

Second, formulate a Federal economic aid program which would acknowledge the inequities inherent in the census and make appropriate adjustments to assure equitable distributions of Federal aid.

We are working along these lines, just as other States and cities are.

Finally, I want to mention a serious matter which may affect the integrity and credibility of the census.

As you know, Federal law protects the confidentiality of an individual's answers for 72 years, that is, until April 1, 2052.

I was not pleased to learn late in April, therefore, that arrangements were under way to allow investigators of the General Accounting Office to visit census district offices and audit individual questionnaires, address registers, forms, and other materials.

In a May 5 letter to Vincent Barabba, I strongly objected to this action because both President Carter and Attorney General Civiletti clearly stated their pledge to confidentiality in proclamations issued earlier this year.

I hope the Congress will take appropriate notice of this matter.

Thank you for the opportunity to present these comments.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Williams, thank you very much.

Your testimony is timely because obviously the Lieutenant Governor has been in the forefront of this 1980 census count. Knowing the Lieutenant Governor as well as I do, and being the New Yorker that he is, I am sure his primary concern is to make sure that we get exactly what we are entitled to, no more, and no less.

A couple of questions, if I may.

Let's first address the very last portion of your statement, as far as the GAO officials coming in and auditing forms, census forms.

When it was first brought to my attention, I responded pretty much the way you did.

The GAO has been very cooperative with this subcommittee in terms of reporting to us and getting some of the work done finding out exactly where we are with this count. They have issued two extensive reports, one dealing with mailing lists and another dealing with enumerators and problems you have had. So what we are trying to do is establish a record, so that whatever the pitfalls are with the 1980 census, we can avoid them in the future.

The reaction of this committee has been one in which persons who go in as GAO representatives will take an oath just like everybody else, and are sworn to secrecy.

We are talking about five individuals, and they all had to take an oath, so that under that set of circumstances, they are helping us to establish the type of record we need. I have, after the initial contact by the Lieutenant Governor's office, no problem with the fact, because I have been made aware that the oath was administered to them, just like it is to every other person in the Bureau of the Census.

You mentioned something about the Governor's special appropriation of $700,000.

Mr. WILLIAMS. He allocated $700,000 from the Governor's special fund under the CETA program to set up this particular census-related program, in which funds were used to support local efforts across the State, and more particularly, by employing 96 people who were being engaged on following up on a door-to-door basis in the area where the undercount problems were particularly severe.

Chairman GARCIA. Is that in addition to the legislation that was passed? I don't know if it was finalized.

Mr. WILLIAMS. This is an allocation of Federal dollars that are available to the Governor under the CETA program.

Chairman GARCIA. Well, the legislature introduced legislation appropriating $3 million as well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; I am not aware that it was enacted.

It was not enacted, to my knowledge.

Chairman GARCIA. It was not enacted.

Do you know that the city of New York is divided into two districts?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Indeed.

Chairman GARCIA. One handled out of Boston, and the other handled——

Mr. WILLIAMS. One is a winner, and one is a loser.

Chairman GARCIA. We are losing in the New York office, and we are winning in the Boston office; is that what you are saying?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are winning the banner for the prize of mail back response from the New York State area as I understand it, but we are not doing as well in the other district.

But as I have indicated, even in the area upstate where the overall rate, in Albany, for example, the mail back response is doing very well, but the enumerators are complaining because they are not getting paid.

However, in our rural jurisdictions, where the problem is severe in this particular way, many of our rural areas, as the statement indicated, a little bit in terms of Federal aid goes, indeed, a long way, so that every person counts on a per capita structure and every person really does not count in terms of the representation that those small areas have in the State legislature and the Congress. So that it is important in our rural areas as well.

Chairman GARCIA. I would hope that you, having the responsibility for being the director of our State's census operation, that if any matters come up, you feel that this committee can help with, that you notify us so that we can get on with trying to figure out what to do. You know what we are doing here, Mr. Williams, whether we are talking about Buffalo, or talking about Montauk Point, or Jamestown, N.Y., we are in this together, and that it is not downstate or upstate, we are in this together as New Yorkers.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is why, Mr. Chairman, the suggestion advanced by Congressman Murphy, for the delegation to meet with Director Barabba, is an excellent one, as you observed, and if we can be helpful in that regard, by all means we want to do so.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Green.

Congressman GREEN. I thought it might be useful if you could put on the record just——

Chairman GARCIA. Excuse me for one moment, Congressman Green.

I would like to let the people here know that we have been joined by Congressman Jim Scheuer, who represents Queens and a portion of Brooklyn.

Congressman GREEN. It would be useful if you could set on the record why it is a problem that the localities were not given the opportunity for a review of the master address registers in advance, and why it will be more difficult to have access by enumeration district rather than by block.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is my understanding, Congressman Green, that this decision was made relatively late in the process as the result of this census evaluation of its budgeting and fiscal circumstances, and the timing and scheduling of the resources that were available to it.

Nevertheless, the point could be made that strategically in planning for the 1980 census, which has been under way for 10 years, we could have anticipated this type of problem, and realized from the 1970 experience how crucially important it is for local officials to be able to examine that master address register in advance.

Even more important is the fact that in large cities, the availability of the data on a block basis, because much of the tabulation that the Planning Commission, and all the rest use in New York City, and in other cities as well, is set up with greater ease on a block basis, so that if the information is provided on that block basis, it would facilitate the checking that the local officials may make.

Doing it on an enumeration district basis does not jibe with the kind of data and the kind of resources that many municipalities have. That means that the process is more difficult, more confusing, more complicated, and to shorten the process to do that from the period of time it is necessary to do so, 10 days is just unacceptable.

Congressman GREEN. Typically in the populated parts of New York City, how many blocks would there be in an enumeration district, roughly?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It would vary from district-to-district because this would be a function of the population of the different districts.

But there may be several—well, in a city such as New York, I would expect there would be relatively few blocks in an enumeration district, whereas in some of our upstate cities, there would be more.

Congressman GREEN. It would be more of a problem upstate?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; and particularly in upstate communities, the complete count efforts, and the efforts of local government are more difficult to organize.

We don't have the staffing or resources, or the inherent underlying data capability to relate to this kind of problem.

This is why the comment included in our statement is that the time required to review the census should be as long as is necessary on a reasonable basis to do so, rather than this 10 day figure.

Congressman GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Scheuer, have you questions?

Congressman SCHEUER. No, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GARCIA. I cannot thank you——

Congressman SCHEUER. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman GARCIA. Yes.

Congressman SCHEUER. If my question has already been asked, cut me off short, Mr. Chairman, because I don't want to waste people's time and I apologize for not being here on time.

You have heard of our concern, I suppose somebody has expressed Ted Weiss's concern of the undercount in poor and minority neighborhoods.

There is another layer of that, and that is the undercount of illegal immigrants or undocumented workers, however you wish to describe them.

Has this come up today, Mr. Chariman?

Chairman GARCIA. Not at all.

Congressman SCHEUER. Can you give us some idea of what you are doing to count illegal immigrants in this town, who have been variously estimated to be between three-quarters of a million and a million and a half people?

Nobody really knows.

We know there are a lot of them. We know there are enough to save probably two Congressional seats if they were accurately counted, and that is a matter of more than academic interest to those of us who sit up here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Congressman Scheuer, you know that I am not an official of the census, I am, rather, on our side.

I work with the office of the Lieutenant Governor in the State.

Congressman SCHEUER. Then let me rephrase my question.

What is your office and the Mayor's office doing to get the census people to count illegal aliens?

How do you perceive the problem?

What are you doing to solve it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The problem is enormous, and the problem is, indeed, challenging.

What the State government has been doing and the local government, I suspect representatives of the city complete count committee will be speaking before you later, but what the State is trying to do is have the committee comprised of people who are residents in neighborhoods, and have constituencies, church-related groups, unions, that sort of thing, and we have provided them with information relating to the nature of the undocumented aliens, and how they might reach out to them to provide assurances to them that they could be counted with safety and to assist them in that effort.

Many of these people who operate in neighborhood centers as I say, church groups, and all the rest, have set up facilities to encourage their people to come in and help them to fill out the forms, help them to understand what it all means, and to provide them primarily, I expect, with a sense of security that they will be safe in filling out these forms and returning them to the census.

I expect that in an area such as New York City, where the nature of the undocumented alien is not only people who are coming to our shores from other places, but they are also people by the hundreds of thousands, perhaps, who just don't want to be counted, people in the city, walking up and down the street, living in our buildings, and many referred to earlier as people who just don't want to be counted, and to try to give them the kind of assurances needed to be safe in doing that, all of this has been a real problem.

This is why, in the other parts of our testimony, we indicate that we have to anticipate that we are going to miss, regardless of how effective we can be in this regard, this is a problem that is particularly significant in a jurisdiction such as New York City, therefore, the results of the census have got to be applied in such a way that they won't be cheated as Congressman Green, I think, used the term in getting our response, and our fair share.

Congressman SCHEUER. To give you an example of how important it is, in Florida, they have had a hundred thousand illegal immigrants whom President Carter may have welcomed with an open heart and open arms, but still they are illegal, and they are in the Miami area.

If Miami gets them accurately counted, it could be a fifth of a congressional district, and it might get them another seat, and that seat might come from New York City, because we have not counted our immigrants.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is a problem that is national in scope, but as concerns——

Congressman SCHEUER. As a representative of one State, facing up to it, you are right, the buck stops there, and they pay it at a very impressive political cost.

And with the flow of the power from northeast to the southwest, as we lose Congressmen, and as the south, the southwest and the west gain Congressmen, it is even more important for us to have an accurate count of our population so that at least we reduce the movement of power somewhat, and at least get everything that we are entitled to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I agree.

Chairman GARCIA. I cannot thank you enough.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, sir.

Chairman GARCIA. The next witness is David Jones, the special assistant to the mayor. While Mr. Jones is coming up, I would just like to say that Mr. Jones has worked very hard, he has taken on an awesome task, a tremendous responsibility, and he has done it with a great deal of integrity.

He has testified before the subcommittee many, many times.

I think sometimes to attending all of these meetings, prevents him from doing some of the work he has to do, but we are happy to have you here.

STATEMENT OF DAVID JONES, ASSISTANT TO MAYOR KOCH

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Chairman Garcia. It is still a pleasure to be here.

My first experience with congressional hearings has been under your tutelage.

I am here today representing the mayor of the city, who is unable to be here because he is out in Seattle at the Conference of Mayors. It is not entirely lost, however, because he is a member of the subcommittee there on the census.

He is going to be strongly supporting the moves by the Conference of Mayors, both to submit an amicus brief in the suit out in Detroit,

68-912 O - 80 - 4

and also demanding certain changes in the census procedure to make appropriate adjustments for the undercount that took place.

Chairman GARCIA. Before you proceed, I would like everybody to know that we have been joined by Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm from Brooklyn, another city in which we held hearings, I know that Congresswoman Chisholm has been having some of her own difficulties in the County of Brooklyn with the Bureau of the Census so I am really delighted she is here to join us.

Mr. Jones, you may proceed.

Mr. JONES. The Mayor has asked me to submit and Congressman Murphy already did, his recent letter of June 2, 1980, to Vincent Barabba, the Director of the Bureau of the Census.

I think it, in essence, supplies most of the difficulties we see occurring in the census procedure, and essentially lays out a number of steps we would like to see taken by the Commerce Department, the Bureau of the Census, in order to rectify them.

I would just like to paraphrase, since the letter has already been submitted for the record, what we see, however.

He says Mr. Vincent Barabba, "That despite the efforts of the city in terms of publicizing the census procedure of 1980, and the extensive effort of the State, the City is presently trailing most of the nation in both mail return of census forms and the hiring of enumerators who are supposed to catch those missed by the mail out procedure. The Commerce Department has already predicted a major loss of population for New York City, and if an effective and all-out effort is not made to count all New York's residents, especially members of minority groups, your agency's estimate of the city's short-fall may well become a self-fulfilling prophesy.

Now, after many months of working with the Census Bureau I am afraid this is the conclusion we are coming to.

The Commerce Department told us very early on that they thought the city had lost almost three-quarters of a million people, resulting in a loss they indicated of three to four Congressmen in the New York City area.

Through a very crude estimation, and through the Office of Management and Budget, we came out with a conservative figure of a half billion dollars in lost Federal funds if this prediction turns out to be true.

It seems now from indications we have, although we have trouble getting information on all aspects of the census from the Federal bureaucracy, that because of problems, essentially central administration problems, we are seeing a problem which is sure to result in just what they told us might happen.

And it starts with the problems they indicated in the General Accounting Office report of the address register drawn from commercial sources, apparently from every indication we have gotten, both through city planning and from the district offices themselves, so defective as to slow the entire procedure down, and as to make it impossible to be certain we have covered each household within the city.

Now, we were told at the very beginning not to worry about the nature of the address register because there would be a special program of precanvass to check out the accuracy of these addresses. It turns out, and I have had this confirmed from almost four sources

now, at most of the district offices this precanvass procedures which was to check on these addresses was either completely left out or shortened to days rather than weeks of work.

Now, this is an ongoing problem that we see, and one we have not really seen rectified as yet.

Overall, we see a problem that I think has to be addressed of an unwillingness by the central Bureau of the Census to allocate sufficient moneys to do this job in New York City adequately.

We have seen an advertisement program that has almost no impact or relevance to New York City's residents.

We have seen shortcuts, and steps left out, and I think, as you go through each witness, I would like them to match up against their own plan just what steps have been left out from local review to this precanvass, to a host of other steps that seem to have been left out more for the convenience than any real concern as to the citizenry of New York City.

I think I will take a case in point.

The Census Bureau at this point is undertaking what is called a "Were you counted" campaign.

Essentially, they are sending out little cards or pieces of paper throughout the city, the purpose of which is to catch those persons who just were not picked up. I can tell you just to disgress for a second, this is the major problem because the city, as you mentioned, has received enormous numbers of calls from people who never received forms, 8,000 by last count.

A quarter of those calls come from people who report entire housing blocks that have not been touched. They are at least reporting whole city blocks that were not touched.

But here is the thing that was supposed to save at least part of that for people who never were in touch with the census.

Chairman GARCIA. If I may interrupt for 1 second, I would hope that you can be specific so that we can enter those areas into the record.

Mr. JONES. I will provide those to you, no doubt about it, I have the listings.

The "Were you counted" campaign, originally I have been told from sources within the Census Bureau, were supposed to be led off with a major television and radio campaign.

I have been informed now that no such campaign will be attempted.

The major element of this campaign will be to insert a printed form within some city newspapers, again on a voluntary basis, requiring people who were not counted to clip it out and mail it in.

We were very happy when we first heard that this was going to come about, but then we were told the campaign was only going to run for 2 days, that the city's idea of perhaps providing franked and postage paid envelopes for this was not satisfactory, and that we should not involve ourselves with this particular portion of the campaign.

Now, I think most of us know that it takes a lot of effort to call up a city bureaucrat and to tell someone you haven't received a form you really don't want to fill out anyway. But asking poor people to fill out forms clipped from the newspaper and go through the whole rigmarole they are intending, surely is not intended to give a complete count of those persons who have not been touched.

We think at the very least there should have been money allocated to televise this event, to send out cards in a form where people could easily make it known that they were not counted.

I think it is indicative, this is just a small portion, but it is indicative of the shortcuts that are being taken at this late date.

Now, I want to talk generally.

I have been working with this campaign for a long time, and I have worked with most of the members of the census, some of the very top-flight people work for the local census offices here, but I must say that I'm hearing over and over again, and I've been talking to census workers, from crew leaders to field operation supervisors, I'm hearing again and again something that I think bodes very ill for the city.

I have heard repeatedly that the census leadership in the view of these workers were expecting criticism from the very outset, and have been told, or are feeling that this criticism is a normal part of the procedure, and one that in some respects can be ignored because in past censuses there have also been congressional outrage and statements, and at that point the Census Bureau was able to stand firm, essentially, and not make major adjustments to the census figures.

It is for that reason that the city is strongly stressing the fact to everyone that it should not, that the Census Bureau should not be allowed to close an office in the city of New York until we are satisfied, you, and the congressional delegation, and the elected officials within the city, are satisfied that an accurate count has been taken.

I do not want to see a bureaucracy go back to Maryland and say throw the bricks that you want, but we are not going to change our position.

The procedure may be a statistical one for them, but it is not a statistical one on the impact on lives of New York City's residents, and I think we have to mount a campaign to make sure that everyone has been counted, and we should investigate every element of this whole procedure and make sure what happened in past censuses does not occur this time.

We have been undercounted before.

We have lost approximately $10 to $20 million in Federal revenue sharing based on the underount that occurred in 1970. We have gone down to Washington to ask for an adjustment of past census figures, and were essentially rebuffed.

We are now told, with regard to the adjustment question, that the Bureau may decide to adjust it's figures to compensate for the undercount sometime in September, that is when the decision is going to be made.

It is interesting to note that almost every census district office will be closed by that time. I don't think the city, nor any of the elected officials in the city, can wait that long for this kind of decision because it impacts on the ability for us to keep our political representation and our funding.

It is not something that is merely another statistical procedure that can wait the year that it will take for them to decide. This, I think, has an impact that demands that there be a decision made quickly, promptly, and at the highest levels.

I hope I have touched on some ideas. I think the mayor's letter goes on to list things we want to see done.

Chairman GARCIA. May I just interrupt you at this point, Mr. Jones?

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Chairman GARCIA. You know that we are just about finished with the followup 1, and then the local review process will start.

Can you tell us where the city is at this particular moment in terms of local review?

I know that Evelyn Mann at the city planning commission is the one who has been charged with that responsibility, but if you could give us some detailed explanation as to how the city is going to work with the Bureau of the Census on a local review. How it works is going to be absolutely essential in terms of getting as accurate count as possible, I would appreciate whatever knowledge you may have.

Mr. JONES. The city is currently engaged in preparing our own address registers, essentially, our own list of city blocks and city units to match against those that the Census Bureau is going to give them, that they claim they have reached out to.

It is a match that goes apartment unit or housing unit by housing unit, it is not a challenge which goes against person by person.

Essentially, we have been precluded from that kind of estimate. Essentially, we have been left with, if we can show that housing unit, or a housing block was missed, or where we show that it was vacant, and they show that it was occupied, that kind of matching is almost in place, we have the computer materials in place for that, and we are starting in the very beginnings of getting some of the data from the Census Bureau to start that match.

We don't have a decision from the Director of the Census as of yet as to what they will allow as a challenge to individuals. For instance, an elected official or someone from the city will say you get a block of the city which you know has at least families which constitute 1,000 people, the Census Bureau comes back with a report that only 100 people are living there.

As of yet, the mere speculation that even from a lifelong living in that communty, that there are 1,000 people there is not sufficient in and of itself to challenge that figure of 100. You can only say you missed the second-floor apartment at 240 Broadway, it is that kind of business as we go along.

They have promised us that there will be some kind of definitive statement issued nationally which will tell how people could challenge individuals.

Chairman GARCIA. When?

Mr. JONES. It goes week by week, I expected it 2 weeks ago. Now, we are told that no statement will be made to New York City until it is made nationally. Again, I am faced with much of the same problems I always have been, that if you wait long enough, of course, the whole question will be moot, and that seems to be one of the problems we are encountering with the Census Bureau.

Mr. FERRELL. What do you propose to use as a challenge.

Mr. JONES. Essentially, we are driven back at the moment to some kind of distribution of cards We would have liked to use as a premise this "Were you counted" cmapaign, but taking this one step further, while the census district offices are still opened, of making a massive distribution of frank cards, mail-back cards which we could start tak-

ing in, which would have a name, address, and apartment unit on it, and use that as an obvious technique of challenge.

We think there should be some survey rights allowed; in other words, doing a survey of an area. Taking a couple of blocks within an area and intensively enumerating them ourselves, or through some system with the census, and to use that as a device to show that this area has to be rechecked.

In other words, you get a district, for instance in Queens, or elsewhere, where community people, the elected officials feel there is a problem. You ask them to target where you think the problem is most serious.

You go into those blocks with a massive team, and you count each one. If the total comes out different, in a significant fashion from that that the Census Bureau has reported, that should be sufficient in and of itself to require a whole new enumeration of the whole district.

Again, something that has not become——

Mr. FERRELL. Is the city prepared to do that?

Mr. JONES. We have to. I think it should be a Federal thing. I think we could probably find the funding to do one or two blocks though, to find the manpower in connection with the CETA people that we have allocated from the State.

I think we would find a way if they permitted.

But essentially, if you keep putting off the question, day after day the less potential this kind of system has.

It is only one.

I am not a technical person. It is one technique that could be used in addition to card mailout.

One of the things I want to point out, I think that in many respects we are going under the assumption that the census has to be in New York City, and that it is inevitable that on January 1, 1981, figures have to come out, and we have to accept that.

If we find, and if it was determined that the census has not met it's constitutionally imposed mandate in New York City, I think we have a right to challenge that whole vis-a-vis this region.

Chairman GARCIA. In 1920 we challenged the Bureau of the Census right here in the city of New York for the same reasons that you are talking about now.

Let me say this to you, and I think it is important to the members of this committee, historically the question of adjustment has always taken place with the Bureau of the Census. It is not a new phenomenon in the year 1980.

It has always been something that occurred, even from the very first census in 1790, they had it at that moment, and it has proceeded every 10 years since. So, there is no magic in terms of adjustment, and I want everybody on this committee to understand that.

Congresswoman Chisholm.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. I am trying to digest what you have said, Mr. Jones, because I don't want to be pessimistic, but even with the follow-up, and all that is to be done, the approach to this entire question from the inception was wrong.

The approach to this entire question from the inception, of course, had to do with a patronage system where certain persons got the jobs, and certain people came into the community knowing absolutely noth-

ing about the community. Now there is a high attrition rate. It is a boondoggle of a mess.

In terms of the kinds of techniques and instrumentalities that are going to be used at this particular point, to retrieve and get the correct count, I don't even believe that is going to succeed because, you see, you are dealing in New York City with large numbers of communities, where, if one is going to get an accurate count, one has to rely on the persons in that community who have a track record of actually living in the community, being able to go to the apartments, being able to flush out people, being able to reach many persons. You will miss someone along the line, it is true, but the approach to the whole thing has been wrong. I don't even know what kind of question to ask you, Mr. Jones, because it just was not handled in the correct way.

We have too many political expediencies attached to this whole situation, and things that have political expediency never redound to the benefit of the people of the community. A correct and accurate count was diluted because politics become the paramount consideration, and you know what I am talking about.

So that I am making a statement. Forgive me, I am very angry, because of what is happening in my community.

I see what is happening. Forms are piled up all over the place. It is just a terrible predicament.

Mr. JONES. In light of this, we should also look into the fact of just who they brought in as top supervisors in the district offices. I talked to a group who came in——

Chairman GARCIA. Let me say this to you, Mr. Jones, we have persons who are going to testify before this committee today, who are exactly the people you are about to describe. They are not the people who work at 26 Federal Plaza, but the people who are working in the community, and have requested from this subcommittee an opportunity to testify. So the record will be established very clearly as to how they view the census, as they are there only for the short period of time while the census is taking place.

Congressman Green.

Congressman GREEN. I guess I share the anger and frustration of Congresswoman Chisholm at the witness' testimony, because I have been calling attention to this problem since the test census data came out.

Do you think the thing is retrievable at this point, and if not, what should we be pursuing?

Mr. JONES. The Mayor's letter shows some of the points that should be done to retrieve part of it. I think we have to realize that neither the courts, nor adjustment will be a solution for the damage done to New York City, and I think there is an obligation to start pumping in the resources, late though it may be, both to advertising and to putting in the highest quality of supervisors and enumerators to this job which should have been done in the first place.

I don't think it is that much to ask the Bureau after a billion dollar expenditure to realize that there is some severe problem that should have been foreseen, and were indicated well in advance of the beginning of this procedure.

I do insist, however, that—the reason we do insist that they should not close the districts offices until we have gotten a portion of this

problem resolved, is because I do not want to confront the last of the options we have then. It is not a comfortable position to be in, and not a very successful one as the Congresman has mentioned.

There have been attempts in New Jersey and elsewhere in the country, and also by New York to get postcensus adjustments, and they never really, even when they have succeeded in part, they never really compensate for the loss, so that is why I think we have to maintain these offices, pump new life into them, and insist that the major promotions be distributed now in the right areas, where it should have been in the first place.

There should have been a much more extensive campaign in minority areas, and with foreign languages also.

Now is the time, and now we have to insist upon it because we have our back against the wall.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Scheuer.

Congressman SCHEUER. I share in this sense of frustation that all of us feel, Mr. Chairman. I share the views of the sense of outrage that Congresswoman Chisholm expressed.

I congratulate you and the mayor's office for having approached this in a very workman-like way, and having done what you could to identify the problems—the various elements of the problems and to point out some ways in which we could get some help from the Census Bureau.

I have a feeling that you are not going to get anywhere with the Bureau of the census, and that you ought to go to the Secretary of Commerce, who is an extremely able fellow.

He comes from Chicago, so he knows the problems of the inner city, and I would recommend that you chat with Mr. Koch and arrange for Mr. Koch to meet with the Secretary of the Department of Commerce, and let him pull in his Census Bureau people, and Congressman Garcia and a few of the other members of the New York delegation, because I feel that it is the only way to deal with the situation.

I appreciate your efforts, and I don't think you could have done anymore.

It is just a pitiful situation.

Chairman GARCIA. If and when we get that meeting with Mr. Barabba and the New York delegation, it will probably be at one of the luncheons that we hold periodically, I will invite you, as the city's person responsible for the census, and Mr. Williams, as the statewide director of the census.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Not of the census, it is one of my duties.

Chairman GARCIA. But you are the person here representing the Lieutenant Governor, and you are the one who has been running around the State making certain people understand the importance of the census, and with the permission of the chairperson of our Congressional delegation, I will ask him to see to it that the two of you will be able to attend. There may be instances in which questions can be asked by you which we may not, as a Congressional delegation, be able to ask.

Congressman SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that a meeting with Mr. Barabba alone is not going to really produce that much. I think that is an exercise in futility. I think we ought to try to get the Secretary of Commerce down with Mr. Barabba so that he sees

the enormity of the problem. He will see how outrageously New York City and perhaps other urban centers are being treated in this regard.

He is the man who has the wherewithal to make decisions regarding the allocation of manpower and resources, and setting priorities and setting timetables, and without his personal involvement, I personally think this is a dog and pony show that we are putting on, and I would urge you to work with the office of the Secretary of Commerce, and to invite the Secretary of the Department of Commerce on that day or any other day to come before you.

I have no reason to feel he won't be responsive.

Chairman GARCIA. The invitation will be made to both gentlemen.

Is there anything else, Mr. Jones, that you would like to add?

Mr. FARRELL. You said you received 8,000 phone calls—the mayor's office received 8,000 calls.

Mr. JONES. Yes.

Mr. FERRELL. 8,000 households?

Mr. JONES. It is individuals who say that their households—we took all of those calls and shipped over the ones where people were willing to give full addresses, we shipped them over to the Bureau of the Census, and we made that Department——

Mr. FERRELL. These are the persons who called.

How many others are you aware of?

Mr. JONES. We can only guess. I mean, we know there have been problems.

I think the Governor's office did a survey in late April which reported that again, with the question of where census forms ended up, many of them ended up because of difficulties in addresses that were vacant, and because of the size of the form, they ended up in lobbies, and were never delivered.

I think another witness has testified to this.

Essentially, it takes a lot of effort to decide, I haven't received the form, and first notice that in the middle of a transit strike, and then to take the effort of calling up a number that you will hear a couple of times on the radio, so that you will have to estimate that it is only the very tip of the iceberg as far as how many people did not actually receive their forms.

Again, we never have gotten access to the address registers——

Mr. FERRELL. So the city's view then, with the response rate of 80 by 60 percent——

Mr. JONES. We know the response rate that they tell us. In the beginning, when the mail return came in, I think the local Census Bureau people can talk to it, I think at the end of the mail out procedure, it was 60 percent, as opposed to a hoped-for return rate of 85 percent nationally.

Now, we heard it crept up into the 80-percent percentile citywide. It still shows districts with major problems, such as north Central Brooklyn, that first started with a return rate of 46 percent, I believe, which was one of the lowest, I think I could frankly say in the nation.

I think they can give the precise figures.

Again, we are only—the mail out—mail return does not give us the full picture, it gives us, first of all, the households they know of that received forms.

They don't talk about the commercial structures that may have been illegally converted, that they may not have been picked up because of the defects in the address register, and the fact that the precanvass review is truncated. It doesn't go to the question of how accurate the answers were, which has also been a problem which was never addressed, and was never overcome because the media campaign was so limited. I think they essentially saved money on the city. I don't think there is any—I think the local census people have some—and the leadership has been somewhat the best you can get, but I don't think there has been very much money pumped into this campaign, I think they cut back local review.

They gave Mr. Flemming, who may speak, 20 people and almost no money.

I think they are playing with this "Were you counted" campaign, and decided let's allocate money for P.S. aids.

They decided to not pay franking costs.

They don't train their enumerators significantly.

This kind of technique is something that Gropper & Gallop would have a time doing.

I hear reports of 18-year-olds going into some incredibly difficult situations, asking how many people do you have in your room?

This idea of local people going into local communities fell apart a long time ago. I doubt many people who are solicited by a census enumerator ever saw that person before. So I think the undercount is already in place, and it is going to swell as the procedure goes on.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Do you know in relationship to other cities or other States, for that matter, if the money appropriated for this census has been higher, lower, or have they been better treated than New York as a whole?

Mr. JONES. I don't think as a whole they have been, but in some ways they have.

Of course, per capita there is more money going out, but essentially they knew from the beginning, the National Academy of Science report indicated, and they knew there was trouble reaching poor people, and people that do not speak English, and yet they constructed an advertising campaign that was as middle America and middle class as you can get.

It was only as an after thought that they even put minority persons in the ads, and very little of that happened.

There is so much hostility and upsetment in the city among poor people, and all the problems that people are confronting to answer a procedure which is so difficult to understand in terms of how it benefits them, and their families.

It is an enormous promotional problem there, and essentially they advocated, they didn't address it, and insured the undercount right there.

Everything the State and the city did as it came about were essentially trying to patch up holes, because it was like putting little pieces of scotch tape on a dyke that is bursting.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Thank you.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Jones, thank you very much for being with us.

The next person is Mr. George Shuman, the postmaster manager of the New York City Postal District.

Mr. Shuman.

STATEMENT OF GEORGE SHUMAN, POSTMASTER/MANAGER, NEW YORK CITY POSTAL DISTRICT

Mr. SHUMAN. Mr. Chairman, as you mentioned, I'm George Shuman, postmaster/manager of the New York City Postal District, which includes the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, and Staten Island, not including Queens.

I am here today at your invitation to discuss our role in the most recent Decennial Census of Population and Housing.

The actions taken by the New York City district during the census-taking efforts were governed by arrangements concluded between postal service headquarters and the Department of Commerce. In May 1979, each postmaster in my district appointed a census program manager.

Shortly thereafter, training sessions for all personnel dealing with the census were held. In late June 1979, we began an advanced check of address cards supplied by the Bureau of Census in order to provide that agency with current information with which to prepare forms.

Where address cards had not been provided, our letter carriers completed forms indicating missing addresses. By early July of 1979, all verified, corrected and missing address cards were returned to the Census Bureau to prepare actual census forms for delivery by the Postal Service on March 28, 1980.

March 5, 1980, was the date scheduled for all delivery stations to verify the availability of the census form for each household. This required carriers to distribute the questionnaires just as if they were being prepared for delivery.

However, as late as March 5, forms for some addesses, which had been provided to the Bureau of Census in June of 1979, had not been received.

As a result, carriers once again completed missing address cards for approximately 132,000 households.

These were immediately delivered to census district offices.

And, despite the fact that we have made all necessary corrections and deletions during the address check, 281,500 census forms covering the four boroughs represented duplicates, nonexistent addresses or razed buildings, and these were returned to the appropriate census district office.

On March 24, 25, 26, and 27, the New York Post Office called the Census Bureau to report that missing forms had not been received, and were told that the district offices were having difficulty preparing the questionnaires.

Consequently, in addition to delivering those forms which were available on March 28, our carriers, for the third time, prepared 78,000 cards for those addresses still without census forms.

We continued to receive forms for individual addresses through mid-April as well as for bulk delivery to some multiunit buildings, which the Census Bureau had indicated would be visited by census enumerators.

There are actually 1,048 such type buildings in the district representing approximately 87,000 households, 1,026 are in Manhattan, 22 in Brooklyn, and none in the Bronx.

Congressman GREEN. If I may interrupt you just so I understand, these are drop delivery buildings.

Mr. SHUMAN. We call them drop houses.

An employee of the apartment house distributes the mail, since ther are usually no mail boxes.

On March 28, we delivered all 1,980,350 census questionnaires on hand. We have no figures in New York on the number of census forms received and delivered after March 28.

The census return questionnaires began to enter the mails in large quantities around March 31, 1980. Each of the 16 census district offices located in the New York City Postal District had been assigned a unique ZIP code which was printed on return questionnaire address labels.

This, in addition to Sunday pickups in Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx, and two delivery trips daily to the census district offices, helped insure prompt handling and delivery of the forms.

An despite the New York City transit strike in early April, we had no backlog of census mail at any time.

I've attached to my testimony a letter which Postmaster General Bolger received from the Director of the Bureau of the Census, expressing appreciation for the assistance of postal employees during all phases of the 1980 census.

This completes my prepared remarks concerning the role of the Postal Service in the census-taking effort in New York City. I am prepared at this time to try to answer any questions you may have.

Chairman GARCIA. A couple of questions, if I may.

One of the problems that came up in the district that I represent, which has a large number of Hispanics, was that when the original forms went out, they went out in English. However, there was a number in the front of that form stating that after they would call that number, a form in Spanish would be mailed if they so desired.

What happened was that in one of the offices, they started putting these kits together, and mailed them to the homes, and what happened next, was that the Post Office, thinking those forms were duplicates, sent them right back to that same census office.

Can you explain that?

Were you notified about this?

Mr. SHUMAN. No; I was not notified about that, Congressman.

I had report that there had been quite a few of the Spanish forms going out in the last couple of months, as a result of this call in May, but I was not aware of any that were improperly returned.

Chairman GARCIA. They were returned because the local post office was under the impression that they were duplicates being sent to these addresses.

Mr. SHUMAN. This happened in the Bronx, that is where most of them had been sent out.

Chairman GARCIA. You had no other problems.

Has anybody brought this to your attention before?

Mr. SHUMAN. No; this is the first time I am hearing about it.

Chairman GARCIA. Did the Bureau of the Census notify you to let you know that these duplicate forms were going to be mailed out in Spanish, so that you would be aware, and the local post office would also be aware and not send them back, that they were not duplications?

Mr. SHUMAN. We were aware that they were going out but we had not, as you mentioned, we were not aware that any of them had been returned under those circumstances.

Chairman GARCIA. In the hearings that we have held, not only here in the city of New York but, throughout the country, many people have expressed a desire that the post office, that the letter carriers themselves, the people who have that intimate knowledge of every community, of every person in the community, that they be the ones charged with the responsibility of taking the census, of being the enumerators.

What would your feelings be on that, here in the city of New York, the area that you are responsible for.

Mr. SHUMAN. I concur that the carrier has more knowledge of the neighborhood than anybody else, a regular carrier in that particular area, and I have no problem with them conducting the census at all.

It would have to be a national program, I would assume, but it could be done, funded by the Census Bureau, of course.

I would have no problem with that.

Chairman GARCIA. You would have no problem with that?

Mr. SHUMAN. We have approximately 10,000 carriers in this district, and it could be done.

Congressman SCHEUER. Do you feel that they have the credibility, the rapport with the people in the neighborhood that they would be received sympathetically and listened to?

Mr. SHUMAN. I think it is much easier for the carrier to get in to talk to someone, easier than anybody else in the neighborhood, in spite of identification.

Chairman GARCIA. Congresswoman Chisholm, have you any questions?

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Yes; I do. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Despite the fact that you did indicate that perhaps since letter carriers have a pretty good knowledge of the persons in the neighborhood because of their daily contact with said persons, that you would not have any deep negative feeling toward the letter carriers actually taking care of the census, provided the Federal Government follows through with the necessary funding; is that correct?

Mr. SHUMAN. Yes.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Well, I would like to ask you another question.

Even if that did occur, it does not necessarily mean that we would still get as accurate a count as we could get, unless there was a period of orientation on the importance of the census.

The reason I say that is because in my congressional district, there were hundreds of forms, hundreds, piled up in hallways, thrown on the sidewalk, sometimes for 2 or 3 days. If you went into a building, you would see the bulk forms, they brought them in, and without looking at the names and taking the time to put them in the mailboxes, just pushed them aside.

We recognize in the area that there are broken mailboxes and certain mailboxes that you cannot get into. We recognize the fantastic—but even in those buildings where that form with the person's name could have been inserted in the letter box, because they were big enough, and all of the necessary records, forms were still thrown aside.

I wanted to know was there a real orientation of the letter carriers as to the importance of this.

Mr. SHUMAN. Yes, there was. They were instructed to deliver to every box, even though it is termed a broken box. For example, a number of people have broken boxes, particularly uptown, who pick up their mail, they were instructed to put the form in that box regardless.

If there was no box, then they were to return it to the post office, but they were given orientation on this, yes.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. We also heard that many of these forms were returned to the wrong district office. Why did this occur?

Mr. SHUMAN. Well, we distributed by zip code, and we had 15 of them. In fact, we got forms from other areas, too, commuters coming in the city, and we have some for Connecticut and New Jersey.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Do you find in the terms of these boroughs that you cover, certain boroughs generally speaking perhaps did a better job than other boroughs, for different reasons?

Did you find you got a better response?

Mr. SHUMAN. From the Postal Service?

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. With respect to the Postal Service specifically now?

Mr. SHUMAN. I am responsible for all of it, and I would like to be a little bit prejudiced and say we do a better job in Manhattan, but that is not fair either. I don't know.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. I am trying to get in terms of what we have done thus far, what are the areas or where were the areas that we seemed to have gotten a fairly good understanding of the whole process, in spite of the built-in difficulties of the process right from its inception.

I was wondering if you got that feeling in terms of your letter carirers?

Mr. SHUMAN. No, I did not. We had all of our delivery supervisors and auxiliary supervisors on the streets, on March 28, and at the offices, to make certain that the letter carriers took everything out and prepared blue cards for a missing address on that day, for every single apartment, not just one for an apartment house.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. How do you explain disproportionate numbers of these forms just being pushed aside or just piled up in a hallway, even where your mailboxes were in good condition, and where the forms had the names——

Mr. SHUMAN. There is no excuse for that.

Congressman Murphy mentioned too that happened in Brooklyn. We had one incident reported that I am aware of on 10th Avenue in the Radio City area, where we took disciplinary actions against the carrier where we received this report.

This is the usual response on our side when it does happen. Delivery should be made to the box, there is no excuse for it.

Chairperson GARCIA. Congressman Green.

Congressman GREEN. In your statement, you tell us that there were 78,000 forms that on March 28 you had to send to the Census Bureau advising them that they were missing.

Mr. SHUMAN. That is an approximate number, yes.

Congressman GREEN. Did you have any way of checking how many of those ultimately came through?

Mr. SHUMAN. No, because they were delivered to various stations, and there was a form, a statement of mailing, that the Census Bureau uses when they make a deposit. The revenue was transacted at headquarters level, not in New York, and we sent the forms to Washington. We kept no record locally of it.

That could be determined. We could run down that figure.

Congressman GREEN. That would be of help.

Mr. SHUMAN. Out of headquarters, yes.

Congressman GREEN. The other thing that puzzles me somewhat, you report delivering 1,900,000, that were on here on March 28.

That is significantly below the estimated number of households in New York City. Do you have any explanation for that disparity?

Mr. SHUMAN. Well, it is below our figure. New York City has 647,000, but we count the vacant apartments, too, we considered possible deliveries——

Congressman GREEN. Your figure is what?

Mr. SHUMAN. In Manhattan, 647,000.

Congressman GREEN. This number does not include Queens, so does that account for the disparity?

Mr. SHUMAN. The district figure would be 2,108,000, and that is a district figure.

Congressman GREEN. And you mailed out 1,980,350?

Mr. SHUMAN. Yes.

Congressman GREEN. What sort of quality control did you have in place to make sure that this job was being done right within the Postal Service?

Mr. SHUMAN. We had monitors in every station, plus a program manager in all post offices.

Congressman GREEN. I am asking that question because there was A General Accounting Office report on the census which does say that the Postal Service did not use any quality control procedures to evaluate carriers' efforts as to detecting and adding missing addresses.

Mr. SHUMAN. We did, in New York City. As I mentioned, we had extra supervisors out on that date.

Congressman GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GARCIA. Congressman Scheuer?

Congressman SCHEUER. I have no questions.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me thank you very much for being here with us. The post office, obviously, plays a key role in terms of where we are with the census. I want you to know that we are appreciative for everything you have done, and that we are going to continue to look for your support, especially as it pertains to the census.

Mr. SHUMAN. Thank you. We are available to do all that we can do.

Chairman GARCIA. We will next have a panel of two: Mr. William Hill, the Regional Director, and Mr. Richard Bitzer, the Deputy Director, from the Bureau of the Census.

Let me say before we start that Mr. Hill took over as the Regional Director of the Bureau of the Census almost at the last moment. He has worked very hard, and wherever possible, which is most of the time, if not all of the time, has been extremely cooperative.

You may proceed however you feel is appropriate.

STATEMENTS OF WILLIAM F. HILL, REGIONAL DIRECTOR, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, AND RICHARD L. BITZER, ASSISTANT REGIONAL DIRECTOR (CENSUS), BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Chairman GARCIA. You have heard much of the testimony.

Mr. HILL. I would like to get a copy of the testimony.

Chairman GARCIA. You will be provided with such.

You have received a good cross section of comments from the Members of Congress who are very concerned about what is going on. You, as Regional Director, have responsibility for the New York City Metropolitan Area, so I would hope that you would be able to respond to some of the points that have been made here by Members of the Congress, and by the people from the city and from the State.

What we determine in 1980, obviously, is going to make all the difference over the next decade, so however you or Mr. Bitzer want to proceed, you may.

Mr. HILL. I will start.

Thank you, Congressman Garcia, for inviting us. We would be delighted to deal with any and all questions, as they arise.

Chairman Garcia, members of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, my name is William Hill, and I'm Regional Director of the Bureau of the Census for the New York region. This region covers the New York metropolitan areas of New York and New Jersey.

I am here today to discuss the current status of the 1980 census.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, we are still in the stage of having interviewers visit those addresses from which we did not receive a questionnaire by mail. Thus, I believe that patterns with regard to the mail-out/mail-back effort and recruitment—items that I know to be of interest to the subcommittee—are pretty well established.

By way of an overview, as of April 19, the mail return response ratio nationwide was over 85 percent. For the New York region, as a whole, the response was 77 percent. Taking a look at the 20 district offices that comprise New York City, the response was 68 percent.

Overall, I feel the mail-out/mail-back operation in this region was a success.

The result of our followup activities are progressing somewhat more slowly than we'd like. However, at this point, timing is not critical, as we are concentrating on a complete and accurate count, which is the goal of the operation.

As you know, in anticipation of possible turnovers or the acceptance of other jobs prior to joining the census, we sought to qualify several times the number of candidates necessary to carry out the full operation. For the region as a whole, we tested 88,917 individuals, of whom 65,315—or 73.5 percent—qualified for a census job.

Since our required work force is 23,033, this represents approximately 2.84 qualified candidates per position.

Obviously, Mr. Chairman, we are watching this situation very carefully, and we continue to test applicants in order to provide an adequate pool of qualified candidates for carrying out the census.

The hiring patterns for the temporary work force reflect our affirmative action goals. For the region as a whole, at the supervisory level, we hired 637, or 25 percent, black; 340, or 13 percent, Hispanic, and a small number of other minorities.

For the total work force, these figures were 8,034, or 32 percent, black; 3,210, or 13 percent, Hispanic; and 190, or 1 percent, other minorities.

Overall, women occupied 50 percent of the supervisory and 56 percent of the total position.

We have experienced practical and procedural difficulties in recruiting in prime areas. We used the following sources to recruit people.

The initial contacts and foundation of the recruiting effort was through a political referral system.

In addition to that, we contacted over 2,000 community-based organizations and advertised twice in over 100 newspapers representing the English- and non-English-speaking press.

We established a centralized phone system, and then attempted to publicize the number everywhere.

We had excellent cooperation from the electronic media with our public service announcements.

In the most seriously deficient recruiting areas we mailed a recruiting flyer to all households. District offices used posters and flyers for local area coverage, including those the city of New York printed.

Mr. Chairman, you asked us to address specific problems which we have encountered. I will address one item now, and Mr. Bitzer will add several more in his testimony.

The New York City transit strike occurred at the most crucial time for the census operation. It reduced our staff in the district offices which caused a delay in mail return check-in. This adversely affected our field operations by having our enumerators contact households which, indeed, had completed and mailed back their census forms. This obviously irritated the public and caused frustration in our enumerators staff.

In addition, the Postal Service, no doubt because of staffing problems and traffic conditions, did not deliver the completed census forms to our district offices as promptly as they would have under normal conditions.

In an attempt to alleviate the field problems we delayed the start of the nonresponse followup by 1 week.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me interrupt you at this point, if I may.

This was contradictory to what was just said by the postmaster who said that in fact, the subway strike, the transit strike had no effect in terms of the post office itself, so that what you are saying here is in direct contradiction, Mr. Hill, to what was just stated.

Mr. HILL. I understand that, sir, and I believe that statistically and otherwise I could prove what I have said.

As I said, in an attempt to alleviate the field problems, we delayed the start of the nonresponse followup by 1 week.

The number of people we were able to test and qualify diminished during the strike period.

68-912 O - 80 - 6

Our telephone assistance staff was reduced at this time and so our level of responsiveness to the public was not what we had staffed for. It is impossible to know how this strike affected the mail return except to say that it was a time of stress for all of us.

No doubt, our "it's not too late" media campaign was preempted to some extent by strike coverage.

We also recognized that some damage was probably done to the long form data items concerning journeying to work, however, the extent of the problem will not be known until processing is complete.

Before Mr. Bitzer relates to you some of the problems we have dealt with, I should like to mention some of the operations which will begin shortly.

First, we will initiate a "Were you counted?" campaign, which will enable someone who believes they have been missed to tell us that. Over 500 newspapers in the metropolitan area will be sent a form to print which people can mail to us.

We then search our records and if the person was missed, we take appropriate steps to add them.

We will also involve all our community contacts, complete count committees and census district offices in this effort.

In a few weeks, preliminary statistical summaries will be going to designated local officials for their review. At the same time, we will be engaged in the field operation called followup 2 during which we independently checked all vacant and deleted units and engaged in a variety of coverage and data improvement procedures.

I've mentioned these operations to indicate why I am confident that the counts in this area will be successful. May I suggest that Mr. Bitzer give his testimony before we both answer any questions.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Bitzer.

Mr. BITZER. Thank you.

Chairman Garcia, members of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, I am Richard Bitzer, Assistant Regional Director for the census in the New York region.

I would like to read you some of the problems we have encountered to date. I will start with the mail delivery and return.

The purpose of the mail census is to give better quality data and to allow the field staff to concentrate in the more difficult areas. Because the post office did not deliver the mailing pieces to the right apartments in several multiunit structures, we were unable to tell easily which units were to be followed up in the field. We did, however, employ the standard procedure of using surnames from mail returns to identify those who didn't respond. This obviously caused enumerators problems initially.

Because of the New York City transit strike, the flow of mail return was interrupted. Therefore, we delayed the field followup to allow sufficient time for mail returns to reach the district offices.

This delay was intended to preclude respondents being asked to fill out second questionnaires. Due to our publicity efforts and the interest by the public, many persons called the New York City mayor's hotline and census offices to express their concern about not receiving a questionnaire. Some people said they had misplaced the original and that they wanted another form.

The mayor's office gave us lists of persons who said that their household had not received a questionnaire or who claimed that while buildings had not received questionnaires.

We did not dispute this claim, but rather checked out address registers to be sure that the address was listed there.

We were not able to pinpoint the reason why, in individual cases, no questionnaire was received by the household.

What we did was mail or hand deliver, in the case of large buildings, another questionnaire to the household or households. We did this for the public's convenience and for our own good public relations.

Even if we had not done this, the household would still have been counted, because our procedures require a personal visit to any household which does not mail back a questionnaire, regardless of the reason.

Congressman GREEN. May I ask a question on that, because it has been troubling me, and your census figures have been troubling me.

A loft building is converted, legally or illegally, in a commercial district. You don't get it on your list that you mail out to. How does the enumerator know?

Mr. BITZER. Well, unless it was picked up in a precanvass operation, if a person is in that unit, and disguises it as such, the person would probably not be counted in the census.

Congressman GREEN. You have no way of dealing with that problem? That wouldn't show up as a reduced percentage of responses, either.

Mr. BITZER. That is correct.

Congressman GREEN. So that if you miss a lot of buildings because you are using old lists, which was the case, then your percentage of response was going to look——

Mr. BITZER. My response to that was there were three post office checks to make sure that they had all the addresses in the postal flow. If a person has a mailbox and they were receiving mail, those checks would have produced it.

Congressman GREEN. They are telling us that they sent back the blue cards and nothing happened.

Mr. BITZER. Well, as you look at the chronology of the testimony, I think you will see that the number of blue cards, as we went on, diminished to a point of 78,000, at what we call, delivery, which was March 28.

Those questionnaires were then prepared in the district offices and were mailed out in the regular mail stream.

They were not delivered to the post offices directly in all cases, they were put in the regular mail stream.

So I guess what I am saying is that every identifiable household that could be mailed a questionnaire was mailed one.

In addition, the precanvass operation which admittedly was an independent check in the early phases of this year to check our master address register, was done and in some instances, in Queens, in particular, we will be doing some recanvassing because of some of the quality control procedures that were developed in our own reports, which indicate that there may have been difficulties there.

Mr. FERRELL. Some of your precanvass was not done prior to the mailing of the form; is that correct?

Mr. BITZER. Prior to March 28.

Mr. FERRELL. How many?

Mr. BITZER. I don't know.

Mr. FERRELL. How many district offices were involved?

Mr. BITZER. I don't have that number.

Mr. FERRELL. How many addresses were picked up after March 28?

Mr. BITZER. You have to remember, if anything was picked up, even a day or so after March 28, we were still putting things in the mail stream until the early phases of April.

In the case of the blue cards that we mentioned here, these blue cards were subsequently made up in the questionnaires, and mailed in the regular mail stream. So that even though the time of delivery——

Mr. FERRELL. No. 1, it shows gaps in the mailing list even as verified by the Postal Service.

Mr. BITZER. For whatever reason.

Mr. FERRELL. And we don't know that the mail list, as checked by the postal service, actually caught every single address in the city.

Mr. BITZER. I think what we have to remember in any procedure in the census, if you look at them from a technical prospective, they are redundant.

For example, we don't have any one procedure to make a full accounting for the deficiencies it is attempted to point out. For example, that is why we had the precanvass, and three post office checks. That is why we have enumerators now in followup 1. That is why we have a followup 2, that is going to take place regarding a vacancy or a delete, and we will check addresses again.

The census is not over. The census operations are redundant in order to reduce the level of error at the next screening.

Mr. FERRELL. If you miss the address initially, and that person did not call, they will not come up in the followup 1 phase. The enumerator will not find that address in followup 1.

Mr. BITZER. It depends, if the person reports not having received a questionnaire.

Mr. FERRELL. If they do not report, if they decide not to report that their household did not receive a form——

Mr. BITZER. We may get them in followup 1.

We have enumerators out there now.

Mr. HILL. May I make a comment to that, Mr. Ferrell, and also a comment to Congressman Green's statement before about the Lower Manhattan dress rehearsal. In fact, we found roughly 2 percent fewer people, but we found over 15 percent more housing units. We did an excellent job in picking up the Soho-Tribecca phenomenon with the conversions.

The city of New York so stated that to us, and I think that you will find that when we do the local review, which is not yet, that we will be on extremely firm ground in terms of the numbers of housing units that we have picked up, and that everyone else believes is there.

I think that you will find that this is true because of the tremendous number, including some internal questionnaire procedures which can direct us to another housing unit.

The one for instance that Mr. Ferrell mentioned, if one of the persons in the building were to receive a form, and they put down how many housing units there are in that building, let's say there is a conversion, three apartments, so that the person puts three, and we had on our mailing list there is only one apartment there, that is an automatic reject for us to go out into the field again in followup 2, and pick up and investigate whether, in fact, there are two more.

Congressman GREEN. I guess the problem I have is that you continually come back and say the enumerators will go back and pick it up, but in my neighborhood there are no enumerators. I met crew chiefs who told me they have 3 instead of 10, and they don't know anyone in the whole office that has more than 3.

Mr. HILL. Congressman, you have identified something that is a real problem. We cannot deny that the East Side of Manhattan has caused us the greatest difficulty in recruiting.

However, as Mr. Bitzer said, the census is not over, and we are right now mounting another recruitment campaign.

We should hopefully have some of the young people coming out of the schools, and I can assure you that the timing will not affect the completion of the census, and we are well underway in that—in your particular area, sir, which is solving that problem.

We have brought in enumerators from other areas already, incidentally.

Congressman GREEN. I pray that is so.

Chairman GARCIA. Have you completed your testimony, Mr. Bitzer?

Mr. BITZER. No; I have some more.

There is no doubt that in an urban setting such as New York City, working in the streets is a very difficult task. The problems that we have had are as follows:

(1) The newness of the enumerators and the learning process made initial progress slow.

(2) The reluctance of households to open their doors to census workers even though they are properly identified.

(3) The difficult task of monitoring enumerator's work for consistency and accuracy.

(4) Various payroll problems have surfaced regarding the enumerators not getting paid on time. The reasons vary, not the least of which is with the enumerators themselves.

The Bureau has instituted procedures to handle the above problems to a conventional classroom-style training and on-the-job training, public relations programs at all levels, quality control procedures to evaluate the quality of enumerator returns and electronic data processing equipment to provide reimbursement to enumerators.

In addition to these procedures, we, in the New York region have added the following:

(1) Utilization of New York City schools as training sites to provide the best possible atmosphere for classroom learning.

(2) Modified training during the strike to accommodate shorter working days while keeping pay consistent with the budget.

(3) In conjunction with New York City and others, participating in street awareness campaigns using sound trucks in the areas where we experienced the most difficulty.

(4) Above the normal field review of enumerator returns we have instituted an additional system which is controlled directly by the district manager to determine the quality of the work. The district manager has field managers reporting to him/her to follow special problems. We have released workers at all levels for inadequate performance or lack thereof.

(5) The payroll system is designed to provide a reasonable vehicle for fiscal control as well as payment for work completed. In urbanized offices, payment is weekly as opposed to biweekly in the case of the more suburbanized areas. This was in response to workers needs even though it doubled the administering and processing of the work load. Nonetheless, in isolated cases individuals have not been paid on time for reasons such as: (*a*) Improperly prepared individuals vouchers, social security numbers, et cetra; (*b*) Inaccurate address on personnel forms resulting in checks being returned to the Treasury, undeliverable; and (*c*) Improper dates on personnel forms.

We have processed in recent weeks an average of 12,200 payrolls regionwide and have recently instituted a manual pay system to meet special needs.

Mr. Hill and I would now be happy to address any questions that you have.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me start off by asking two questions.

Local review, and keeping offices open beyond the date.

As of this moment, when do you propose closing the district offices throughout the city, the community offices, what is the target date?

Mr. HILL. I would like to have the offices closed by the end of August or at the very latest, the beginning of September so that we can meet the requirements of the law in terms of getting it processed to the President by the end of the year.

Chairman GARCIA. Obviously, you heard testimony here today that the city of New York, in the opinion of these members of Congress, and the people who testified for the city and the State, they feel that by closing the offices prematurely, or on target, that this will create a problem. You yourself stated in your testimony at the beginning and being very frank with you. I said this the other day during our informal hearing in Washington, that the transit strike was only one week in duration, and both you and Mr. Bitzer state your testimony blaming the transit strike as a factor in the census count.

Now, the person here who is the postmaster general stated that that is not a problem, and——

Mr. HILL. That is not so.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me go beyond that.

You talked about Mount St. Helens while in Washington, that was a factor, and you talked about two or three other areas.

The problem I am having is that I find that the testimony being prepared and presented to the Congress is testimony already looking for excuses as to—please let me finish, as to why it failed, before we even finish.

Let me finish, please.

One of the areas that I want to be very specific about, is that the transit strike itself may have been a factor, but like everything else, you just go on and forget about that, and complete the job.

Now, if, in fact, the transit strike was a problem, then we have to start placing in line all those other factors behind it.

Are you going to say, that we will have an extra week of enumeration, an extra week of local review, an extra week of those offices being kept open because of transit strikes some place.

Mr. HILL. Let me not say, or let me not state or give you the impression that I think we are trying to set up an excuse with the transit strike.

It was a particularly important week for us, or actually a week and a half, but in no sense will that be the reason why in New York City we will be later, in general, than most of the regions.

We will be later in New York because of the inherent difficulties in doing field work in the city. We have large numbers of people that we need.

We turned over a great many people who perhaps are not prepared really for what they thought they could do.

We do, and we have now instituted additional quality checks, none of which I particularly want to spell out right now in public, to insure that the count is proper.

When the census is complete, and it is not complete by any means, we have a great many more coverage improvement procedures which are planned and which we are going to undertake.

When it is complete, however, I think you will see that we have responded, that we have reacted to each and every thing that occurred to us, including the transit strike in the appropriate manner. And that we have given every resident of this city an opportunity to be counted.

I hear an awful lot of criticism, frankly some of it this morning which I feel was ill informed, inappropriate in a free society.

We have protected the confidentiality, as you know very well, very jealously.

Some of the things I heard this morning would be breaches of confidentiality in my judgment, some of these things that were proposed. That is the mandate to the people, to give the opportunity to be counted.

We are doing that in as many ways to think of. There is no problem with getting resources.

They have not stinted on anything that I have asked them for. They have given us money.

We have budgets for all of the things we need. It is not a matter of budget. Now, it is a matter of getting people in the streets, which we are doing, making sure that they have done their jobs properly, which some of them do not, and then going forward, week to week, until we have this amount of followup we have, and it is shrinking tremendously now, down to a point where we can polish it and polish it again.

That is what we intended to do.

I want to tell you, I am getting no pressure from headquarters about timing. They are fully aware of the problem.

Chairman GARCIA. Let's talk about local review.

Now, we are almost at that point of local review, and 2 weeks, obviously, are not enough. I am going to enter into the record, there are no secrets, and I suggest to you, Mr. Hill, that the reasons we

are holding these hearings is to get the facts, and you just stated that you aren't willing to state some of the facts.

Mr. HILL. About the Q.C. procedures: I would be delighted to discuss them with you, of course.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me go beyond that. In terms of the local review, in my conversations with Mr. Barabba, he made it clear to me that while the 2-week period is there, that if localities needed additional time, they would be given that additional time.

At this moment, how much additional time do you feel the city of New York is going to need to get to the point where the city planning commission can go in and check block by block?

Mr. HILL. I don't know, but I could tell you this for sure: We are already checking geographical locations already for the city of New York, and, in addition, as we close one district office after another, we are going to flow that to them on a piecemeal basis, and we are going to tell them, this one will be closed, and they have computers, and what have you, and I don't see, frankly, with the sophisticated system that New York City has, that after the last office is closed in New York City, that they would need much more than 10 days because they would only be responding to 1 or 2 offices at that point, and not to the 17 or 18 that have closed previously, and obviously if they come in with something after 10 days, which has substantiation, and the real point is that people will get working on it immediately.

Chairman GARCIA. Who will make the decision as to whether it is substantive.

Mr. HILL. We will, but we have guidelines. I have discussed this with the technical people in New York City already, and some have mentioned a letter, the letter is out now, incidentally.

Chairman GARCIA. That is my point exactly.

I don't think the Bureau of the Census alone can make that judgment, because the Bureau of the Census, as soon as you finish the census count will walk away, and those of us responsible from the governmental standpoint, are left there, and are charged with that responsibility.

That is the reason why I cannot, as the chairperson of the subcommittee, sit here and say that the Bureau of the Census is going to make those decisions.

I believe the city of New York has to equally play a role in terms of being sure that local review is accurate, because the city of New York is, in fact, the one who is going to end up paying the price if the Bureau of the Census, in their determination feels that the local review is accurate. You will walk away, and say I will see you in 10 years.

Mr. HILL. Not really, I am also a city resident.

Chairman GARCIA. I understand that. I am talking in general now.

Mr. HILL. What I mean is this: I had a long discussion with the person in the city administration this week, and it came down to this.

What I said was look, if you tell us, gee, I think this neighborhood has more people, because they feel that that is true, they seem to be crowded there, I say, well, where are they, which tracks do you feel this in?

Is it a housing unit problem?

Is it gee, you think there are more people in this apartment, or that apartment?

We do not have the resources, nor de we have the cultural tone in our Nation to go and investigate every household again.

This is not an investigatory procedure.

I think whatever anyone said about the mail, or the delivery of the mail, whatever, that the people of this Nation responded pretty well to what they perceived to be a pretty good public interest thing, and that is answering the census.

Even in the poorest neighborhoods of this city, it is because of the lack of delivery, not because people wouldn't do it. We got over 55- to 60-percent mail return.

Chairman GARCIA. Does that include vacant buildings?

Mr. HILL. It does not. That is an estimate of occupied.

Chairman GARCIA. Those are actual persons who place their names on the census forms, along with the other data?

Mr. HILL. Yes indeed. Some people said they couldn't get numbers out of us. I gave anyone who called numbers.

There was no reluctance in the district office, I did not understand that comment, very frankly. What I am saying is that we could not deal with a thing like you might get in the mail, gee, I think there are nine people in this household next to me. We could not deal with this on a statistical basis with 3 million households.

What we can deal with is this is a public housing project, there are only 400 people there, and we know that there are 1,800 people there.

We will deal with that.

We would be delighted to check with that.

Mr. FERRELL. What do they have to present to you?

Mr. HILL. What I said, this is public housing, Red Hook buildings, and there are 1,800 people in here, management says 450 units are there.

If we don't have it for some reason in our records, we will check that without question.

But we cannot check the vague kind of things, I think that in this neighborhood there has to be more people than this.

There is no way to deal with that.

Mr. FERRELL. Then it is just the most glaring omissions that really would be followed up. If there is a housing project and someone says to you, we think there are more than 400 people here, that is what you will follow up on.

Mr. HILL. Remember, in terms of housing units we will be able to deal rather specifically.

We have the geography on maps, we have the serial numbers so that they can say there is 200 in this E.D. and you have 120, that can be checked.

When we check our records, we will see, we know why, something was burned down, something was changed, something was built there that is not a residence, et cetera.

This is all in the plan, and we are all ready to do this, and we have been doing it already, to tell you the truth.

We are checking things already that we feel to be aberrations in our local knowledge.

Chairman GARCIA. Congresswoman Chisholm.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Frankly, I don't know where to start. But it is a bureaucratic bungling mess.

You said on page 2, in paragraph 3, that you had practical and procedural difficulties in recruiting people, and you used certain processes to recruit people.

One of these was through the political referral system. I will be very personal now, extremely personal, because the 12th Congressional District is one of the three or four districts that are targeted for some changes because of the decimation of population since the last census. Therefore, it would be to my benefit and to the Congressmen in these other areas, to their benefit, to make sure that we get an accurate count.

Therefore, when we had understood from the inception that the congressional offices and Congressmen would have an opportunity to make recommendations, since their political lives are at stake, if you will, I made a recommendation of three or four gentlemen who had marketing experience and a knowledge of polling experience to head up the office in my 12th Congressional District, for example, and these gentlemen did not have any political connections with me, but because I knew that the 12th Congressional seat must be counted whether or not I continued in office, we knew from past experience that blacks and Hispanics in that area were always undercounted, and we wanted to make sure that we got out and secured the best we possibly could to make sure that that area is counted regardless of whether or not I continued in office. It was not done.

Then on page 2 of your testimony, Mr. Bitzer, when you have the problems we have been encountering, the newness of the enumerators, the reluctance of households to open their doors to census workers, even though they are properly identified, knowing the makeup of some of the areas of the city of New York, with large numbers of illegal aliens, with numbers of persons that rightfully or not have a disproportionate fear of anything connected with the Government, knowing all of these things, we were also in a position to recommend people from the area who would be able to get hundreds of these persons to open their doors, because of the relationship through the years in the community with these persons then who would be the enumerators.

All of that was completely ignored.

Now, you have a mess on your hands. The reason that you are having all of these problems is because from the inception you have instituted a procedure or a process which, in my humble opinion, and you have a right to disagree with it, in my humble opinion, it was not really a priority item in terms of trying to get as accurate a count as one can get in the minority areas of this Nation, given the specific unique problems of the minority areas.

I cannot blame you, Mr. Hill. You have to take your information, and your guidance and your orders from the Federal Government.

All I am saying to you is that all of this did not have to happen.

Even now, at this late date, there are community organizations and community groups, who, on the basis of their experience in the community, who on the basis of the knowledge of these people who are so afraid to open their doors, will open their doors if these persons went to take the count.

I am just so—I am just so upset with the entire mess because the whole thing, and we've heard me say this before, was based on an election year, and I know you are going to deny it, but you can deny

it if you desire to do so, and persons who could have really given more accurate help and assistance were not permitted to do so because they were on the wrong side of the fence in this election year, and this is too important, too important to blacks and Hispanics to just use it in terms of political expediency, and not get people who have some kind of knowledge, and who would be able to relate to enumerators that they know about.

Now, I have said a lot, and I am mad, and I am angry, and I know you want to respond.

Go ahead.

Mr. HILL. One thing I would like to—I would like to separate some of this.

In the centralized offices, of which there are 87 in this country, there are professional Bureau people working there. I have the highest regard for their dedication and what they have done so far.

They have literally worked themselves almost to death to get this count right, and so there I would demure from what you have said.

I think anyone who has met them, and who has talked to them, and who sees what they are doing, knows how hard, regardless of where they come from——

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. I am not speaking on an individual level, I am speaking in terms of the criteria of getting a job done.

Mr. HILL. In terms of the referral system, we had difficulty with it managerially. I would not deny that.

This is my personal judgment, and I want to so state in the record that I am speaking for myself there.

Chairman GARCIA. I am glad you said that, because the Bureau of the Census, in the Washington office, has stated that they welcomed the political——

Mr. HILL. I do not welcome it any longer, and it has been a problem to us, and I would not deny it for 1 minute.

It has been one of the most serious problems that we have had, very frankly. I believe that in some cases, people will refer to us, I don't know whether we ever saw the people you mentioned or not, I don't know, frankly, I honestly don't.

People will refer to us who perhaps, for one reason or another, did not have only the count in mind, and in some cases many of them didn't work real hard, and we had to terminate them, and when you terminate people, or otherwise have difficulties managerially with the people who are supervisors, or others, in a short-term operation, you do have difficulties.

I would not deny it, and I would say that it has been true that it has been a difficulty for me.

So there you have it.

Congressman CHISHOLM. Forgive me if I seem disproportionately emotional about the situation, it is not that I am disproportionately emotional in terms of my own district because I always like to think of the next generation, future generations to come, and this is only done once every 10 years.

What really hurts is the fact that I do not believe the entire question of the census would have had at least 50 percent of the difficulty that it is now experiencing if they had related to it in terms of an across-the-board communitywide operation from which would come

your enumerators, where the people in the community would know these persons, and would not be afraid to open the doors, from which would come persons who have marketing experience in polling procedures, and what have you, to head up the offices in the areas, because as I said before, it becomes a very, very selfish responsibility in terms of the minority legislators, at least in the city of New York, to make sure that they get as good a job done as is humanly possible, because traditionally these are the communities that are always undercounted, these are the communities where the enumerators have to come in, and are afraid to go into the community because of all of the stories they hear about the community. All of this could have been avoided.

Yet, here we are at this hour, the 11th hour, trying to come up with what I like to call band-aid procedures to really patch up a lot of festering sores all over the place.

I don't truly believe that they are really going to be able to get the kind of count that we really need to get. I have very deep feelings about this.

Mr. HILL. That is why I disagree with you. The thing is not over yet. The subtleties, the checking, the nonhousehold checks which we are going to do, the delete check, the check again independently of buildings, all of these are going to help a great deal.

I believe this. I am not stating this just because I don't believe it.

We are not done in the field.

I mean, the point about field work is that you get a lot of it done, and you look at it, and you get some more done, and you look at it again.

We have the expertise here, and we have the people here to be able to do this, and we are doing it now.

In addition, I think that we did a pretty good job in educating the community. We had a community services program, headed by, in this region, a Brooklyn resident, frankly, who contacted 3,800 organizations in our community services program.

We gave out postage, all kinds of things, 2.5 million pieces of literature, was delivered, and, incidentally, each and every one of those community organizations is going to be involved in the "Were you counted?" campaign.

We have 32 languages involved in this.

We will send this to community organizations so that they can distribute it to anyone who says I was not counted, here is your chance. We are hoping we will get cooperation.

We have been out there several years in these organizations, churches, PTA's, community boards, all kinds of levels of involvement. I don't feel we haven't done that.

I feel in terms of 1970 to 1980, the publicity was much better, the local review is now a formalized situation, and we have a better mail return.

We actually have more interviewers on the street than we had then.

I have looked at the old records, I was here at that time.

Mr. Cullinane, in the back, was the director at that time, and until recently my boss for a long time. I don't feel that this thing is over.

I feel that statements like outrageous jobs, and frankly, mess, are really not appropriate at this point.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. Let me say this.

I am going on the basis of what I have collected thus far in the central Brooklyn area. I will continue to say that it is a mess in the central Brooklyn area.

The numbers of persons who have not yet been counted, the number of enumerators who have dropped out of the process because of their fears of going into areas, that did not have to be. It didn't have to be.

There were people who were ready to do the job, because they knew, they are smart enough, we must not deny the fact that citizens have now learned how important it is to have every individual counted because our Federal distribution of funds, and the apportionment of seats, and everything else depends upon the census.

So I am not going to say that we would have gotten every individual, but I sit here, and I will tell you, my heart aches because of all of the money and procedures and followups that you now have to go through.

From the inception of this program, sometimes we suffered from myopic vision. We became so imbued with statistics, analysis and percentages that we did not see the overall picture of why it was so terribly important to put together a mechanism that would give to you the greatest return in terms of the future lives of minority people who have been left out of so much for so long, and this is what bothers me, believe me.

Mr. HILL. I hope you can be of some help right now.

We have started the recruiting campaign again this weekend for the remainder of followup 1 and for followup 2, which will be going on for 4 to 6 weeks plus any checkup we do as a result of that.

Anyone, or any organization that you feel that is still interested in doing apprentice work in your area, I would be delighted to have someone call your office in the morning or whatever, to make sure that these people get involved.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. I am working with the local regional director who is here.

Mr. HILL. I would be delighted. We are doing work now, and we will be doing more work.

Chairman GARCIA. On the question of adjustment, is the Director of the Census or the Secretary of Commerce, going to take recommendations, as far as adjustments are concerned, from the area regional director, if you feel and find that the count we are submitting for the Metropolitan New York area is not what it should be?

Mr. HILL. I have no idea whether the director would ask my advice on this matter, frankly.

Chairman GARCIA. Adjustments were made in Miami, in Dade County, in 1972.

Mr. HILL. I will certainly give to the director, or anybody else, especially, of course, the director, my detailed feelings about what went right and what went wrong in any individual areas.

Our feeling, I guess, is that we have to get this census done as accurately as we can, and then there will be time after the count has been completed for us to begin to talk about those very major issues, frankly, all of which are way beyond my power and control.

But if asked, I would be delighted to give my frank opinions, of course.

Chairman GARCIA. And what would that be?

Mr. HILL. I don't have a frank opinion now. People talked about counts earlier in their testimony. I don't know any counts.

I don't know how anyone else is getting that information. Mr. Bitzer is in control of the computer operation. I don't know where people are getting their information from.

Anyone who called, local elected officials, Federal officials, whatever, if they had a specific fact, they could give it to me, and I would be delighted to check it out.

We have done this in thousands of instances.

Chairman GARCIA. In 1970, we did not close the local census offices until October 1.

Why are we now jumping the gun by 1 month, especially in view of the transit strike, and other causes of delay with the census?

Mr. HILL. October 1, is not my recollection, and I just looked at—I have an administrative report that I looked at this week, which I think says September 17, but all right, what is the difference?

I don't think we are jumping the gun by anything.

I think it is well recognized that New York will have some district offices which will be among the last closed in the Nation.

The reason for that is we want to do the job right. We are not going to close anything here precipitously.

Incidentally, people have mentioned about not closing the office before we tell anybody. The local review letter that is going out, that will go out with the preliminary count to local officials, so that roughly from this time, when you receive this letter, most district offices will be open for 45 days.

We will be doing followup 2, and some other procedures at the end. So that if someone identifies something as a problem, that can be identified specifically, that we cannot expect in the field, it will be checked in time.

In 1970 as you know, offices were closed, not here, but they were closed in the country, and that is why the local review program was put in place.

We gave a preliminary number, 2 days, and the doors were locked, and we went away, and no one could respond, and we didn't have any fieldworkers left.

It is not the case this time.

We had over a month and a half to deal with these problems, and that is plenty of time.

Chairman GARCIA. What kind of success have you been having in the Washington Heights area, in the Crotona sections, and the Elmhurst sections of Queens?

The reason why I ask, is because those are areas in which there are large numbers of persons who are not citizens.

What kind of success have you been having in those areas?

Mr. HILL. I don't have any specific feelings about that. I have about the ones—I have not heard about Crotona being a problem, frankly.

Chairman GARCIA. Corona, I am sorry.

Mr. HILL. Corona. I have heard, as a field problem, anything to do with Corona. The district manager is not here today, but I have not heard of that area.

We had some difficulties in the Washington Heights area, and I think that had more to do, frankly, with personnel and management problems.

To be truthful, that is the major problem we have in the census with so many new people of all levels, rather than a respondent problem, a household problem.

I think it was more a matter of getting the thing tightly run, and what have you. We have dealt with that already.

Chairman GARCIA. So what you are saying is you could not give us any data as to how——

Mr. HILL. I don't have any at all.

Chairman GARCIA. Well, you know how many forms you mailed out, and you know how many forms you've gotten back.

Mr. HILL. Oh, OK, I know the mail returns, yes.

Chairman GARCIA. And those forms——

Mr. HILL. The mail return, 135th Street North, it was in the seventies, I know it was.

We have probably 15,000 or so households to followup yet on the nonresponse.

Mr. FERRELL. What were the total mailouts up there, in pieces?

Mr. HILL. Even though I am a statistician, I don't memorize all of these numbers.

We had a mailout of about 125,000.

Chairman GARCIA. Is that a list of the 17 city offices?

Mr. HILL. It is the whole region which you are free to have, of course.

Chairman GARCIA. Would you be kind enough to submit that for the record, I would like to have that.

Mr. HILL. Sure.

Chairman GARCIA. So the Washington Heights area and Corona area have returned forms just like every other area?

Mr. HILL. Yes, absolutely.

Chairman GARCIA. You would think that because of the question of noncitizenship those forms would go unanswered. So, it seems those persons have not been afraid to come forth.

Mr. HILL. I am hoping so. I don't have any knowledge like that.

I will tell you what we will know at a point.

What we will know at a point is pretty soon, when we get to the local review, as the E.D.'s get finished in followup 1, and we start doing the preliminary tabulations on them, we will know where we have had difficulties, where we have had refusals and what have you.

We will be able to tell, and I am sure everyone who is involved will be delighted to tell us whether we have missed a lot of people or not, but my feeling is that we have not had that difficulty because of that.

I can particularly tell you that I do know this, since I have had conversations with a lot of managers, that we have—it seems, they had a fairly easy time in areas of high Hispanic concentration, I don't know why that is, but that is the information that I am getting, that our followup has been received well, for whatever the reason may be.

I am not sure again what the reason is.

Mr. Bitzer would like to make one comment.

Mr. BITZER. My comment is in reference to Congresswoman Chisholm's remarks.

Chairman GARCIA. Right after this, as soon as you finish your testimony, we are going to take a 5-minute break, and we will come right back to get any additional testimony.

Mr. BITZER. One of the concerns that Mr. Hill and I have had, and Mr. Cullinane when he was with us in the beginning of this census operation, was the fact that—one of my concerns in the beginning, administratively, and Mr. Hill and Mr. Cullinane shared this, is that we were wondering if we could get some type of release that those on welfare would not be penalized for working for the census.

We have asked, and we have asked, and we have asked, and to the best of my knowledge, I do not understand the legal implications, but I understand that it was on the floor of the assembly, or in the process somewhere, but we never did, in fact, get that release.

And I have to say quite honestly, that persons who may be able to open some of those doors for us may be just those persons who shied away from our recruiting, no matter what we have done.

We sent cards. We sent letters. We have had advertising.

My goodness, we have done so many things, it will be hard to delineate every one of them now.

I think that quite honestly this may have helped us. I wonder if this subcommittee could find out for me and for the Bureau what has been done in this area. Maybe at this last hour, something could be done in that area as well.

I will tell you, it will help us tremendously.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. You raise a very interesting point.

Mr. BITZER. Thank you.

Congresswoman CHISHOLM. This is always the real difficulty when those persons who sit on the very top lack the sensitivity and an attunement to the practical, pragmatic aspects of a situation.

They are up in their so-called academic, political towers, drawing the graphs, making the charts and analyzing, curving the upfall, and the downturns, and then they have absolutely no understanding of the application of that knowledge they have up there to what is going on out here.

This is exactly what we are really talking about.

I am so glad that you raised that because that would be one of the instrumentalities that could be used.

But too many of these people who sit around shuffling the papers and drawing the lines do not know what the heck is going on out in the street.

Mr. BITZER. Congresswoman Chisholm, I think I am very pleased to hear your reaction to that because it has been mentioned in all the testimony we have heard today, and I think if we look at the number of persons who may, in addition to welfare, want to supplement their income with census work, and who live in these areas, the poverty areas, the minority areas, where we need the personnel to do this, it would have been a great help to us.

Chairman GARCIA. I want to thank both of you for being with us today.

We will now take a 5-minute recess.

[Whereupon a 5-minute recess was taken.]

Chairman GARCIA. Our next witness is going to be Steven Rosenberg, a former crewleader with the U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Mr. Rosenberg.

STATEMENT OF STEVEN ROSENBERG, FORMER CREWLEADER, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Rosenberg, please be seated.

Mr. ROSENBERG. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am honored to be here today to tell you a little bit about my experience in working on the east side of Manhattan, and some of the difficulties that we face in that area.

The major problem areas that we found—I found was in the recruitment, in the master address register, and in the support of the field workers by the office.

In addition to that problem, what compounded a great deal of it was the interface with the post office, and I will give you an example of some of the problems I found there because that precedes a lot of the other information I will provide.

Much of this has already been mentioned, but the bulk distribution of the census forms, rather than to individual households, and what has not been mentioned is the problem that that creates for the crewleader, and for the enumerator in the field, and that is there are people who pick up a form, and mail it in, if it is not the form for their specific household, the address, the serial number, the other information, will be entered with their name. However, for a different household.

What that will do is create a situation of an apartment mixup so that if you go to apartment 8A, and Mr. Smith does not live there, he lives in apartment 1A.

Did apartment 8A answer?

No one knows.

The problem is that enumerators are paid on a piece-rate basis, they are paid only for those forms which they complete and are acceptable. They are not paid to solve apartment mixups, they are not paid to solve problems in their address registers, these are problems that are so complex that they would take hours to solve.

Crewleaders are paid to do that, and it takes hours, and a tremendous amount of cooperation from people who really have no obligation to do so other than they realize that you have a problem, and that they would like to help you.

The recruitment problems now are ones in which Mr. Green, the Congressman from my district, and I did provide him with some of the information with the problems that I was having.

I, as a crewleader, should have had approximately 10 people.

I feel if I had those people, I certainly would have completed my district in the time that I was with the census department.

The most I ever had at any one time was one person.

I understand that now they have brought in people from other areas which have been completed, and are working in my former area, in my former crewleader district.

One of the problems early on in the census——

Chairman GARCIA. Is that why you left the Census Bureau, because you did not have enough people working with you?

Mr. ROSENBERGER. I left the census in part to pursue other career opportunities that have opened up to me, but aside from that, I really don't want to be negative, but I did not want to participate in what I, in my own opinion, consider is a con job.

Chairman GARCIA. Would you repeat that?

Mr. ROSENBERG. A con, I don't think that the way it is working in the street, which is absolutely impossible to sit in an office and determine how it is working in the streets, you have to be on the streets, and I am not talking about Harlem, I am talking about Sutton Place, I am talking about what it is to take the methodologies that we have prepared for you in the central office, in Washington or Maryland, or wherever, and try to implement those proposals.

Any plans, no matter what it's motivation, are only as good as those peoples and those policies which will have an effect on the implementation of that plan.

Chairman GARCIA. I don't want to put words in your mouth, but are you saying that there are different strokes for different folks, and that the people who live on Sutton Place as opposed to people who live in Harlem and the South Bronx, should be enumerated differently, or that forms should be different?

Mr. ROSENBERG. That is not the point at all.

In an area where crime is not a problem, where fear of the streets is not a problem, where abandoned housing is not a problem, it should be simple.

Chairman GARCIA. I would think so; yes.

Mr. ROSENBERG. There shouldn't be these problems.

I am saying that if we have tremendous problems in an area such as that, then I don't think anyone can fully comprehend how big a problem it is in the regions that are more difficult to work in.

As a recruitment plan that the Census Department devised and sticks to a 100 percent, it was that people should be working only in the areas that they are from, in their local area.

My district is an area of high employment, very high wealth, and that is directly a problem as to why I had no crew most of the time.

I suggested to my district office, my district manager a solution, and that solution was having many of the people who work in the area, in office buildings, who work 9 to 5 in Manhattan, every day, they are familiar with Manhattan and also had a desire to enumerate part time, which was a position that they were willing to fill, part-time enumerators after work every day, and on Saturdays.

I was told by my office that the only way that this could happen was that if they would use a local address such as mine. I was not prepared to become a surrogate post office and distribute checks, and what have you.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me interrupt you for a moment.

When I became chairman of this subcommittee, I was hoping to work out a formula where the people who were enumerators would be from the communities they were to enumerate. In past years I can remember young whites in the South Bronx trying to get a count, and I said to myself, one of the reasons why the South Bronx didn't get it's fair share was because many people were just turned off because these kids were not from the community, they were people who had no familiarity with the community.

So one of the things I insisted upon in 1979, during this process, was that people from the community count that community.

I did that because I wanted blacks to count blacks, and Hispanics

to count Hispanics, because I just felt it would be easier getting the information.

Whether it turns out to be workable after it is all over, is yet to be seen, this committee will have to determine that.

But in the case of the east side of Manhattan, where everybody is earning upward of $30,000, $40,000 a year, they figure what the heck do I want to work for a couple of bucks an hour. They don't see it as a worthwhile venture from the monetary point of view, so it may have created a problem in your district. That is, our insistence that local people be participants in the process may have created problems, because in your district you could not get the people to come forward, they were not interested.

Mr. ROSENBERG. Well, as I say, I agree with the philosophy. It would seem that they would have a greater intimacy with the area, that they would possibly know people in the area, although it's such a high density area, the percentage of people they may know makes that irrelevant.

The situation is such that at the district office level or at the regional office level, they do not have a quick response to situations that are happening when that recruiting process did not work, and they knew of it early on, so that where we should have had 900, we had 90.

I am talking less than 10 percent, some areas did have 10 percent.

They don't have the processes whereby they can react quickly and effectively, and say this is a special area. We cannot recruit people in this area, this is a special area.

They have to be counted.

Part of the problem I found out was later on people were saying you are still taking the census.

So maybe this "Were you counted" proposal that they have will be effective to let people know that there is still a great need for their cooperation.

The office support that I found was on a very, very low level and so increased frustration. People mailed in their forms late continually, and late mail returns, whereby a crew leader will inform his enumerator to check his master address register, that certain people have, in fact, been responsive, was so long after the fact, that somebody who mailed in their forms, for instance, on April 10, was only—I was only notified of it in the final day that I was in the employ of the Census Department, which is May 26.

I am talking about a 4 or 5 week delay in notifying the crew leader of a late mail return.

Now, no enumerator knocked on the door because I didn't have any enumerator, so it didn't inconvenience my enumerators or the person, but that is not—that is not satisfactory in my viewpoint.

Now, talking about the office support, in addition, I found that many of the buildings—there weren't identified problems of missed buildings in my area, and I went and did an apartment listening to include that information in the master address register, I found that during precanvass, people had been there, gotten the information, turned it into the central office—district office, excuse me, and it was never reflected in my master address register.

In other words, we had the original effort of getting the mailing list. We had the post office reviewing the mailing list.

We have precanvass.

We have probably another step I am leaving out, because I am using my memory, and then as late as a month after the date, it still has not found it's way into the Census Department records.

Backing up a little bit to the recruitment problem that I had, I don't know that you have seen the competitive exam, in English.

Chairman GARCIA. Not only did I see it, I took it.

Mr. ROSENBERG. Can I ask your impression of that exam?

Chairman GARCIA. I thought it was a difficult exam.

Mr. ROSENBERG. You did think it was difficult?

Chairman GARCIA. Yes; I thought it was difficult, and I had an hour and a half in which to complete it, and you only had an hour.

You know what——

Ms. ROSSANT. You didn't think it was difficult?

Mr. ROSENBERG. No, I did not.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me say this, it took me 1 hour and 10 minutes to complete it, and I thought I was doing well because I finished 20 minutes ahead of time, actually I had gotten 10 minutes more than I was entitled to.

Don't ask me how I made out.

Mr. ROSENBERG. I won't.

Chairman GARCIA. Well, for the east side of Manhattan, it may have been easy, but I can tell you there are many people, the people who we want to recruit to do the enumerating, people from communities such as mine, and Harlem, and Bedford Stuyvesant, we aimed at recruiting these people, and I thought it was too difficult a test.

Mr. ROSENBERG. The point that I was going to arrive at was that when you do have a cutoff for what an acceptable score will be for that exam, I don't feel that a solution to not enough enumerators is to continually lower that expectation to the point where it may be as low as 10 questions out of 54 answered correctly.

I don't think we are recruiting qualified people at that point.

Chairman GARCIA. I think somebody else is going to testify to that point.

Mr. ROSENBERG. Very well. I am not speaking from a prepared statement, I am trying to provide information to you from my observations.

Chairman GARCIA. What you can do, if there are any specific questions or statements that you would like to make, is send them to us within 10 days, and they will be entered in its entirety into the record. So if you have missed anything, it is all right.

Mr. ROSENBERG. As far as the—oh, yes, this is a very specific problem.

The—one particular building, 60 Sutton Place South, received its forms and the forms that it received were addressed—the return address was addressed to a Riverhead, N.Y., district office.

Part of the problem, in nonresponse statistics, that could be generated because the district office in a given amount of time never received their forms, and it could very well be that who knows how many forms are sitting in Suffolk County which obviously cannot be counted in Suffolk County, and possibly in followup 2, or later processes, they will be returned.

In the meantime, you have people knocking on doors or they have already returned the form.

If it is a computer foul-up, that may very well be, however, like I say, the amount of time that it takes for this Department's bureaucracy to react to the problem is such that it causes a tremendous amount of frustration on the part of enumerators, who do have a quota, and he can be terminated or let go if he does not meet his quota.

I would just like to provide the opportunity to answer any specific questions that you might have.

Chairman GARCIA. No; I have no specific questions. The ones I had, I asked while you were making your statement.

I want to thank you very much for being with us and again, I repeat, if there is any additional information you want to supply to the subcommittee, feel free to do so, you have 10 days.

Thanks for coming.

OK, there are three panels of witnesses here, one from the Bronx, one from Manhattan, and one from Brooklyn, and then one individual who is also going to testify.

I would hope that we can complete this hearing within the next half hour, some of us have other engagements which we must get to.

I am going to take the prerogative and call my county, the county of the Bronx first. There is a panel of five people who will be coming up, a Mr. Angel Landron, a Ms. Carmen Pinilla, Jose Talavera, Leon Martin, and Eli Serrano.

STATEMENTS OF ANGEL LANDRON, ELI SERRANO, CARMEN PINILLA, JOSE TALAVERA, AND LEON MARTIN, ALL FROM THE BRONX DISTRICT OFFICES OF THE U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Chairman GARCIA. I know that the five of you are here without prepared statements, and I would suggest that each of you take a minute or two to express to the subcommittee some of the problems that you have had. What we are trying to do here is not so much to get after anybody, what we are trying to do here is to establish the type of record that is going to be essential for future census taking, that is our sole purpose and our aim.

There is still time between now and the end of the census taking, and before submitting that data to the Speaker of the House, and what I would hope we would be able to do is, in those areas where you have direct responsibility, you express to the subcommittee some of the problems you have been facing.

Why don't we start off on the left-hand side, with Mr. Leon Martin.

Mr. MARTIN. My name is Leon Martin, I'm the district manager for South Bronx office.

I have not experienced any extreme difficulties in recruiting and staffing in the South Bronx at the district offices that I manage, due partly, possibly, to the unemployment rate in that particular area.

We have had a good response in that sense.

One of the problems, however, I have been faced with is the high vacancy, and the situations or conditions within the geographical conditions within the area, in that our master address registers are reflecting addresses that currently do not exist, and it is making the second part of my operation much more difficult than the first part.

Mr. FERRELL. You are talking about the high vacancy rate that is shown on your address registers.

Are you following up on every reported vacancy?

Mr. MARTIN. We will be following up on every reported vacancy in followup 2.

Mr. FERRELL. What is that percentage right now?

Mr. MARTIN. I cannot say specifically what percentage it is. I think we possibly have at least one-third of the housing that we expected when we—that will reflect I am sure, to be blown out or vacant, as we describe a vacant unit to be.

Mr. FERRELL. Now, a form letter will be mailed to this address, right, on March 28?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes; forms were mailed to those addresses.

Mr. FERRELL. The forms were not returned and enumerators went out?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes, on followup 2.

Mr. FERRELL. How were those reported vacant units treated?

Were they treated as part of the unreturn, nonresponse rates in the Bronx?

Mr. MARTIN. They were currently considered as nonresponse rates, as far as the location because it was vacant, and we could not get a response from it, naturally, so it makes the nonresponse rate for that particular district office rather high.

Mr. FERRELL. You are saying about a third——

Mr. MARTIN. This would be general, I didn't say exact. It would be very high because of the blown-out conditions of a lot of the buildings.

Chairman GARCIA. How many forms have come back to you?

Mr. MARTIN. We have approximately 50,000 forms returned.

Mr. FERRELL. Out of how many?

Mr. MARTIN. Out of a work load of an estimated 98,100.

Chairman GARCIA. 50 percent.

Mr. FERRELL. What was your initial mail return rate of the total?

Mr. MARTIN. Approximately 47 percent, as I figured it to be initially.

Mr. FERRELL. That is lower than the city's average.

Mr. MARTIN. Possibly so, but then we had all the vacancies that we couldn't get a response from. So truly, it is difficult to compute the rate.

Mr. FERRELL. Thank you.

Mr. MARTIN. Generally, that is one of the most difficult problems.

The main problems I have had are personnel problems with managing an office and so that I am sure you are not interested in getting into that, but it is management problems regarding personnel, which constitutes the largest problems in my particular district office.

Chairman GARCIA. Ms. Carmen Pinilla.

Ms. PINILLA. My name is Carmen Pinilla. I am the regular technician for the district office in the South Bronx, 2245 and 2248.

I would like to pick up from where Mr. Martin had left off in the management of the office, and some of those problems that have been encountered by the two managers to those offices to which I am responsible.

Some of the problems have involved low morale on the part of the staff, which is affecting the office and the field operations, or the work that is required for those operations.

That lack of morale or low morale is directly related to some of the problems that we have had with our payroll system. The major problem with the payroll system is that the checks, payment for the work performed, have not been received as that staff person has expected to receive it.

Additionally, it takes approximately 4 weeks for every person to receive a first paycheck. Thereafter, it should be received weekly.

However, for many reasons, these checks are delayed. The practice involves an initial reporting by the staff person of the number of hours worked, and then it involves a supervisor reporting—in addition to the number of hours, the operation code for each operation in which that person works, and then it requires approval by that person's initial supervisor, and then the operations supervisor, and submission to the regional center, and finally by the administrative person who is in charge of all payroll matters in each district office.

Some of the procedures that have to be followed in reporting the payroll are somewhat combersome.

Chairman GARCIA. You were going to use the word bureaucratic.

Ms. PINILLA. No; I was not. Really, I was not.

They are cumbersome in that wherever—one of the procedures that we are able to follow in the district office is that if a person has completed every operation, has a limited time within which it could be completed. Where we find that employees are performing work in another operation, and where we have found that those persons' performance and productivity is agreeable, or in keeping with the production standards that are specified by the Census Bureau, we have the mechanism and the ability to transfer that person from one department to another.

We have a field operation which is a form of a department, we have an office operation, and we have a special place operation, and we have a recruiting department, and we have an administrative department.

Now, wherever we have found that people can continue their employment from one operation to the next, we have the ability and the procedure by which we can transfer a person from department to department, for those persons as I said before who have produced to our satisfaction, and we maintain that person on the payroll as long as we can.

These are the people who are indigenous to the area, as are specified in our hiring procedures, as people who need money, who are in need of some kind of income, and who we are trying to help integrate into the working force through our own operation at the district office.

Now, what happens is that every time a person is transferred from one department to another, the pay code for that particular operation changes, a new form has to be fed to the computer in order to change the eligibility of that person to be paid under that particular code.

If there is any error made at any point in the reporting of these changes, then that person will not be paid. That person's payroll will be delayed.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me interrupt you, if I may.

One of the problems of working in a poor area, is that people go and do their enumerating, and they figure next week they are going to get paid $200 or $100.

I went through those frustrations as a kid, I remember working for somebody, going to get paid on a Friday, and it wasn't ready, it is quite frustrating when you are counting on the money. It seems that those persons who work in areas like the South Bronx and Harlem, as opposed to the East Side where this probably seldom happens, does not concern just one person, but a good part of the community has to accept the blame for the fact that their checks were not on time.

The people who work there, who have responsibility for payroll, should make sure when applications are submitted, and submitted correctly, that when those persons come to get their pay, there are few problems.

I mean, I can understand the situation with coding, but these are not career civil servants, these are kids coming in off the streets. So, I am not going to accept delays due to improperly prepared individual vouchers, or inaccurate addresses on personnel forms, I will not accept that.

There are people that are making damn good money at the Bureau of the Census, let them accept the responsibility.

I am sure there are isolated cases in which you have decided and can state for the record that it was an individual's fault, but in many of those incidences, I will not accept the fact that it is the people, the enumerators, and the clerks, working in those offices who should accept the blame.

Ms. PINILLA. It is not my intention to put the blame on anyone.

Chairman GARCIA. I understand that, Carmen, but you are explaining codes to me. I don't understand and I am a Member of Congress, I am the chairman of this Subcommittee on the Census, and I don't understand.

So how do you expect someone who comes in, first of all they are scared silly taking the test, coupled with that when it comes to getting paid— come on——

Ms. PINILLA. What I was leading to is a suggestion that this system, the payroll system be changed.

If we could eliminate, for example, a lot of different technicalities and pay codes or operations codes, if that is feasible at all, I would suggest that this be done, that additional staff be provided, for example, to the Administrative Department, who could handle it on a more personal basis, with additional time allowances within which to correct any errors made by those persons, because errors are made.

But, to a great extent, it is not their fault.

The time limitations we have from operation-to-operation, from task-to-task, even within a specific task, we have a great deal of work, we being the enumerators, the clerks in the office have a great deal of work to perform. I'm not trying to make excuses for anybody in either direction, but I think that that payroll system which we now have can use improvement.

Now, on the other areas along with employment, I would like to suggest as well, that in order to upgrade a level of morale and dedication to the work in the Census Bureau, which I have seen is a problem at the district office level, I would suggest that the Census Bureau offer every supervisor in charge, every operations supervisor, that person who is in charge of a specific operation, I would like to see that person

offered integration into the Bureau's full-time permanent career employment as an incentive and a reward for good performance.

I think we are lacking in this area.

The supervisors that we have now have not, including, as a matter of fact, all of this staff at the district offices are not offered this kind of incentive. We have a great pool. I have been able to see, as regional technician, I am the official representative to the district office in the regional census center, and I have access to the information in both of my district offices, including the recruiting files and the administrative files, and any other work that is done in the district office.

I have been able to see firsthand that that we have a great pool of intelligent, knowledgeable people from which to draw.

However, when they are confronted with the issue of a temporary position, they are no longer interested.

They applied to the Census Bureau, to the district office, because they felt that this was employment for more than 2 months, for more than 6 months, something on which they could count on for an extended period of time.

When they have found out that that is not the situation, they back off.

I would like to see more incentives provided in the form of permanent career employment options.

Chairman GARCIA. Is this material that you have prepared?

Ms. PINILLA. No.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me say this, because I want to get to Eli.

Any material or any statements, along with any recommendations that you may have, besides the payroll recommendations those to career ladders and I agree with both those concepts, I would hope that you would put it down on paper, and give it to me or Mike Ferrell, counsel to the subcommittee, and we will enter it in it's entirety into the record.

Let me get to Eli Serrano now, and find out how he's are doing.

Mr. SERRANO. My name is Eli Serrano, and I am the assistant district manager of office 2248.

Being a former teacher for 11 years, I think one of the biggest things we can do, if we want the census to be an ongoing experience that can really count people, is to educate our people about what the census is.

If we had a program right now in the schools, the same way they teach social studies, science, math, English, let's teach them what the census is all about.

If we do that, we will find out that ten years from now, we will have of a problem than we do now, because our publicity has been good, to a point, so far.

We have had a lot of people off the streets telling us they want to be counted. So that something is working there.

Maybe we have reached a time in our society where people want to get counted. Let's work on that.

I believe education is a key factor here.

The other point that really bothered me was the welfare situation.

I believe we should work harder in what we did in trying to get, I am not saying this from the Bureau's prospective, I mean from our legislative people, we need, we really need, if anybody is indigenous to the area, and really knows the community, they are those people

on welfare, and we could have really used them, and we tried, and we tried, and we were getting together on a bi-weekly basis, and the main concern is why do we have to keep turning all of these welfare recipients away, let's give them a job.

I think it is still on the floor of the legislature, and nothing has been done on that, and that has hurt us a great deal.

Chairman GARCIA. I thought it was a reality.

I couldn't agree with you more. I did not realize that it had not taken place.

What about the personnel themselves? Are you finding that the people in the community are doing the job?

Mr. SERRANO. Well, that is a loaded question, Mr. Chairman, because morale is so low that at this point we cannot tell whether they can do the job.

Mr. FERRELL. Why so low?

Mr. SERRANO. The main reason is the payroll. You see, it is my belief that this census was designed for middle America, which is great. The guy goes off to work, the wife is home, she has time to go and do a week's operation, or a 2-week operation, but these people in the South Bronx, this is it, this is food on the table.

And when you are going to get a job, and the first thing they tell you, if everything works right, it will be 4 weeks before you get paid, that is devastation right there.

Mr. FERRELL. How about the piece rate?

Mr. SERRANO. The same thing.

Mr. FERRELL. There haven't been any modifications, have there? Nobody is being paid hourly?

Mr. SERRANO. No.

Mr. FERRELL. Are people making the posted wage?

Mr. SERRANO. The only way you could characterize the piece wage system is by a good worker, he can make good money if he is a good worker.

You find these people who want to go out there and do a good job, but then when you throw things at them like not getting paid for 5 or 6 weeks, it hurts, and the morale goes down, and as soon as the morale goes down, the performance rate goes down.

Mr. FERRELL. What is the turnover rate? Do you know?

Mr. SERRANO. I cannot give you specifics on that, but I believe it to be real high.

But in most cases, the turnover rate is not that they have been fired, it is because they quit, because they have not gotten paid.

Another thing is I thing the training, I think the training should be longer.

Chairman GARCIA. What is it now, 2 days?

Mr. SERRANO. Yes.

Chairman GARCIA. Do they get paid for those 2 days?

Mr. SERRANO. Let's be honest, to take a person off a street and to sit him down and to give him training, you are not just going to take that person and completely change him from a person out in the street, who is looking for a job, and teach him all of these clerical functions. Sometimes it just doesn't work.

I believe they need more training, I believe they do, especially if we are really interested in a serious count, because we have to understand

that to graduate from a New York City high school, all you need is an 8.0 reading grade, that is all you need by law, 8.0.

That is not an awful lot.

I think the Times is written on a higher reading level.

These people have no trouble in reading, and I am speaking from being a teacher, but they have trouble in comprehension, and there is one thing you have to be good at to study these manuals, and that is comprehension, to understand what you have just read.

That is it.

Mr. FERRELL. Is it a high-quality enumerator that we need?

Mr. SERRANO. I would say so, yes. The test is ambiguous because this is not really an indication of what that person can do, because we have had cases where people have pulled 49's and to be perfectly honest with you are bombs, and we have had people who have gotten 20 or 21, and they have more dedication and responsibility.

That is a factor that we forget, the factor of responsibility, I guess to yourself as an individual, that you will give your best to the job, and even if it is hard, you will go ahead and do it, because you have to prove to yourself that you can.

A lot of people are not like us here.

Mr. FERRELL. As an assistant district manager, you are in charge of recruiting?

Mr. SERRANO. Yes.

Mr. FERRELL. Based on your experience, you think that the test that was used should either be modified, or substituted?

Mr. SERRANO. I believe that the crew leader should get a different test. This system we have, which is beautiful, of promotion, if you get a certain test, and it doesn't cut you off, but if you work good as an enumerator, that works in some aspects, and in others it does not.

It could be that that enumerator got two beautiful buildings to work in, and it was easy for him to do it, and he didn't have to draw on his own resources as a supervisor, and if you make him a supervisor, as a crewleader, it is a different ballgame.

Now, he has to supervise and get reports in, challenge people when they are doing things wrong and use leadership. Maybe they should design a different test.

While we are speaking of designing, I have one more point, the application that we use for census employment, the B263, there is a little box there that says if you've never worked mark this box.

You don't know how many 35- and 40-year-olds mark never worked, because they don't want you to know, and you have no way of following up what type of work that person may have done.

Maybe a different application for those people who chose clerical work could be utilized itemizing what their activities in clerical work have been.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Talavera.

Mr. TALAVERA. My name is Jose Talavera, and I'm the district manager of the East Bronx, 2246.

I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and this committee for allowing me to address you here.

I can say that for the East Bronx we have not really had too many major problems in reference to recruiting.

Chairman GARCIA. Where is your office physically located?

Mr. TALAVERA. 1641 233d Street Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GARCIA. And you are responsible for Riverdale and Co-op City?

Mr. TALAVERA. Co-op City, sir.

The greatest response I have gotten was from Co-op City.

The mail return in my district was 80 percent, I believe one of the highest in the city.

As to the question of recruiting and staffing, I have been lucky to have had a good D.M., Ms. Minnie Skinner, and I have given her primary responsibility for being out there in the community and sort of spreading the gospel, as you might say.

Chairman GARCIA. You're a district director you are from Washington as well, right?

Mr. TALAVERA. Yes.

Chairman GARCIA. So that the three district directors that are here testifying are all from the Bureau of the Census out of the Washington, D.C. office?

Mr. TALAVERA. Yes.

Chairman GARCIA. And it is the assistant director who is the community person. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. TALAVERA. Yes.

Chairman GARCIA. OK.

Mr. TALAVERA. Because I am in constant liason with my D.M. and the community organizations in the East Bronx, we were able to get a very good cooperation from the community.

Right now we are in the process of finishing followup 1, and we have a load of approximately 9,700 cases.

Mr. FERRELL. How many were mailed out?

Mr. TALAVERA. We know that it was about 149,000 households, approximately.

Mr. FERRELL. And you received how may back?

Mr. TALAVERA. We received over 80 percent in the mail return.

Now, we are completing followup 1, and what is left of it in cases is about 9,700.

Chairman GARCIA. You are saying that once you get this 9,500 cases, that you will have a 100 percent for your district? A 100 percent total complete count of the district office you are responsible for?

Mr. TALAVERA. I would say yes, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GARCIA. What about those persons who are not on that mailing list?

Mr. TALAVERA. Well, I have a way to tackle this problem.

I have my field operation supervisor identify possibly what we call frontal dwelling areas, and these are townhouses or lowhouses that have two different entrances, and usually these people, because of economic reasons do not declare the second apartment as being an individual, so that using my enumerators and placing the leaflets under the door in these areas, I am hoping to pick up the rest of them.

Again, the housing count is essential here, so when we get to the field review count we should be able to identify the areas that still have not been counted with the help of the city, meaning that if it is a particular building in a particular neighborhood that perhaps was not counted right, I am willing to go out there and check block by block to make sure that people have been counted.

I have been lucky enough to identify the problems before they were major.

I foresaw some of them, and took action before they became a major problem.

This is due to the fact that I have very good people in certain positions that I've been able to keep my eyes open and like I said, identify a problem before it becomes major.

On the question of payroll, I can safely say I have none, where to the point out of about 800 people, maybe 15 or 30 have got some sort of a payroll problem.

As soon as I was aware of it, we were able to again take action.

As to the question of staff turnaround, only the people who were uncooperative and unwilling to follow the guidelines were terminated in my district office.

I am here because I want to do a good count. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The following statement was received for the record:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOSE M. TALAVERA-TOSO III, DISTRICT OFFICE MANAGER, BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Mr. Chairman, distinguished Members of the Committee on Population and Housing, my name is Jose Talavera, District Office Manager for the East Bronx. In addition to my testimony on Saturday, I would like to rebut the statement made by the Representative from the U.S. Postal Service, in which he stated that no problems were encountered during the mail-out/mail-in processing of Census questionnaires.

The Wakefield branch of the Postal Service stationed at 232nd Street and White Plains Road, mailed 13,000 questionnaires one month ahead of schedule. These had to be set aside until April 1, 1980, so the Telephone Assistance Center Personnel could verify the data on that day. Needless to say this caused a great deal of extra work for the District Office Personnel.

During the actual delivery of mail on March 28, 1980, the Post Office did not match questionnaires to the actual addresses, Instead they merely placed the questionnaires randomly inside the mail boxes, without checking the right address to the proper questionnaire, thereby creating unnecessary confusion in address mix-ups. This was a particular problem in the Co-Op area, as well as many other large Housing Developments.

The Representative from the Postal Service, in mentioning Sunday deliveries to all District Offices, stated that there was no problem with Postal Personnel during the week of the New Yorkk Transit Strike. This is simply not true. On Easter Sunday, April 6, 1980, the Regional Census Center charged me with the responsibility of picking up mailed questionnaires from the Central Post Office in the Bronx, located at 149th Street and Grand Concourse, and delivering them to all 4 District Offices in the Bronx. The South Bronx Office received 12,864 questionnaires, the South West Bronx Office received 20,237 questionnaires, the North West Bronx Office received 40,000 questionnaires, and the East Bronx Office received 40,473 questionnaires, making this a total of 113,574 questionnaires that were picked up and delivered, not by the Postal Service, but by Census Personnel. Mr. Chairman, at no time during or after the New York Strike, was there any Sunday deliveries made by the Postal Service.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to address this committee.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Angel Landron.

Mr. LANDRON. I am Angel Landron, the district manager in the South Bronx.

To tell you the truth, I have very little to add to what has been said because two of the people who testified here are from my office, and they covered everything very well.

However, I would like to say about the testing, that the crewleader is the main key in this census taking. If he does not supervise his enumerators, we are in trouble.

So to determine, to select a qualified person for a crewleader, a special test should be assigned to measure capabilities that we are looking for in a supervisor, not just to get some other persons who took the enumerator test.

The same thing is true for the office staff, we have people in the office that really cannot even add, and a special test should be assigned to office people. It would work a lot better if you could give an office procedure test.

The way we are now, we have to get people from the enumerator's operation into the office. We have a good recruiter in our office, and we were able to get from the Bronx, from the South Bronx, enough people to be able to select in certain instances, for example, for the office work.

Now, for the enumeration aspect, a lot of people did not want to go out in the field, therefore, we had to get whatever was available in certain instances.

Chairman GARCIA. What was your mail-response rate?

Mr. LANDRON. We received about 50,000 questionnaires, out of I would say 70,000 households.

I say 70,000, although we mailed out about 120,000 questionnaires; 40,000 of them were—the post office returned them as undeliverable, burned out buildings, and boarded up buildings, et cetera.

Chairman GARCIA. Why was that done when, in fact, two or three post office checks done prior to the first mailing?

That is the part that confuses me about the South Bronx, because we should know all of that.

The post office knows better than anybody.

Mr. LANDRON. The questionnaires were addressed way before.

Chairman GARCIA. I understand that. I understand that.

The problem I am having is that if we did postal checks prior to the actual mailing, that in itself would have told us that that building is not existent, and yet we still went through the procedure of mailing all of these forms which came back undeliverable because there is no building there to deliver to.

Mr. LANDRON. I think somebody said something about the double-checking of the Census Bureau procedures, and we want to see that this is right, and we checked them again, we check them in followup 1 and followup 2.

Chairman GARCIA. You said you had 40,000 forms that came back.

Look, I have been to your office many, many times, and I have seen those boxes just stacked up there, it seems to me that all of that could have been avoided at the very beginning just with the postal check.

I don't think that is your responsibility.

Ms. PINILLA. I would like to address that on just one point.

Much of that mail that was returned to us includes addresses or households which, in effect, exist, which, in reality, exist.

The procedures that were followed by the Postal Service was such that we sent out a mailing which had been preaddressed, although there was an existing building or a unit there or not, they were preaddressed, and we did not have the time within which to check address

by address, or mailing piece by mailing piece, to pull out those that we knew already didn't exist.

However, after that mailing went out, we received many, many calls into the district offices requesting questionnaires, people who had not received questionnaires.

When we checked back our address registers, we found that these had been designated or classified by the Postal Service as deleted addresses, nondeliverable addresses.

Mr. FERRELL. Would you followup on all of those?

Ms. PINILLA. Yes; we did.

Our procedures include following up on every call that we received from people who either wanted a Spanish questionnaire or had not received a questionnaire. Every one of those requests was answered and we again received every one of those questionnaires from the post office marked as duplicate.

Mr. FERRELL. The gentleman on the end was saying that out of 90,000 forms mailed, including the undeliverables, about 70,000 came back.

Mr. LANDRON. About 50,000.

Mr. FERRELL. Than you had 40,000 undeliverables?

Mr. LANDRON. We had 40,000 that were returned to the post office, and now we have the followup 1 operation and we have been able to get them.

Mr. FERRELL. How many were undeliverable?

Mr. LANDRON. Followup 1, we are starting this week. We are following up on 16,000 units. Now, this is in units, still there are some of those buildings that are burned out, we want to check that again to see if there is anybody living there.

Mr. SERRANO. The reason I make this statement now is I would like to go on the record, in our office we have people who called in for Spanish questionnaires, and the procedure is you get it together, and you mail it out to them.

Chairman GARCIA. How did you put those kits together? Didn't you have to take those kits and make up your own kits to mail those Spanish forms out?

Ms. PINILLA. Yes.

Mr. SERRANO. Yes.

Chairman GARCIA. Why is it that in a community like the South Bronx, with all the talk about the Hispanic forms for the first time, that we didn't have kits in Spanish? We had 10 years to prepare for it, and we didn't have kits?

In some places, they didn't even have the forms to mail back. They were hoping to get an enumerator to go out there to do it.

This is what we are trying to establish here.

In the final analysis, it is the people who get short changed, it is not the bureaucracy, you are going to walk away, I am going to walk away, and the people will be stuck there with no recall. They are going to say, well, in 1980 there was a census taken, and this is what happened.

I don't want to preach about it, but our responsibility is to the people, and not defending and not looking for excuses why it did not go right.

We are just looking for the people, and how we can help them.

Mr. LANDRON. If I may, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman GARCIA. Yes.

Mr. LANDRON. In our office, we had packages made with Spanish questionnaires and English questionnaires, however, we had so many requests for Spanish questionnaires that we had to build our own kits.

Chairman GARCIA. I understand that, but that should have been anticipated.

Look as far away as East Los Angeles, which is predominantly Mexican, there were not Spanish forms out there either, and this was the first time questionnaires were printed in Spanish.

The fact of the matter is, the key here is 10 years, as disorganized as I may think I am, give me 10 years, and I think I could do anything.

Here you have a whole bureaucracy, working together. and nothing comes about.

I realize they had some difficulties in personnel changes and things along that line, but 10 years is a very long time. I know there are other things that are done at the Bureau in between, but I don't want to beat a dead horse. The point is made.

I want to thank the five of you for being here.

I now want to bring up both Manhattan and Brooklyn together, in panels of two, and that is Mr. James Hughes, Mr. John Vignali, Mr. Aubrey Barnwell, and Mr. Albert Massillon.

In addition to those four individuals, I want to also ask Mr. Frank Depesa to come forward.

STATEMENTS OF ALBERT MASSILLON, JOHN VIGNALI, AUBREY BARNWELL, AND JAMES HUGHES, FROM THE BOROUGHS OF MANHATTAN AND BROOKLYN DISTRICT OFFICES OF THE U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS, AND FRANK DEPESA, A FORMER EMPLOYEE OF THE U.S. BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Chairman GARCIA. Before you start, I want to thank all of you for your patience, because you had to sit through and listen to everything since 9:30 this morning. You are the last ones to testify; please go ahead.

Mr. MASSILLON. Thank you.

My name is Albert Massillon, and I am from the Central Brooklyn office.

Let me say that on the illegal aliens or the undocumented workers, I am Haitian by birth, and we do have tons of illegal aliens in my district area. That is one of the reasons I requested it because I thought I could help.

One of the things that I think would help would be to get immigration to stop their activities during the census; that would help a lot, because we are trying to convince the illegal aliens to come forward.

Chairman GARCIA. Have you had any success?

Mr. MASSILLON. Some. The reasons I have success are because I have gone on radio stations; I have gone to churches—every Sunday to a different church to meet with them.

Some of my crewleaders are leaders in the area, so that they can convince people to fill out the forms.

Some of my enumerators are legal aliens now, who used to be illegal aliens, so they know the problems, and they are trusted in the community, so I have had some success.

But still there are people who don't want to be counted.

The advertising was more toward middle-class America and the advertising should be more toward poor people, black people, and people in the lower socioeconomic status. I think that all the top-level supervisors, except the recruiters, should have come from Washington, because of the type of work we have to do, the discipline involved—we should have people from Washington who are used to working on time, at 9 o'clock in the morning or 8:30 in the morning, until 5 o'clock in the afternoon—and they understand the hierarchy, they know what disciplines are involved in running an office, and for that, I think the top supervisors should have come from Washington.

In the test, when I first looked at the test, I thought it was a joke, I thought it was easy, but so many people flunked it, and I am convinced now that it is hard.

We complain about the test being difficult on one hand, and on the other we are complaining, well, people should be able to fill out a pay voucher which is not really difficult.

How do we ask a person to fill out a pay voucher, if a person cannot pass a test, when we ask for 21 out of 54 questions, which is not bad, from my point of view.

Also, in the post office, on Easter Sunday, my boss had asked me to go to the post office, the main post office in Brooklyn, to coordinate all the mails for all the Brooklyn offices, because what happened is that the mail was sitting there at the post office, and they could not dispatch them to the regular post offices because they didn't have the personnel to do it. So we went to the main post office in Brooklyn to get the mail for our own offices; if we didn't do that, the mail would still be sitting there, at least during the duration of the strike.

That is all I have to say. Thank you.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Vignali.

Mr. VIGNALI. My name is John Vignali, and I am from the North Manhattan office.

Most of my complaints have been hit.

Chairman GARCIA. Where is your office?

Mr. VIGNALI. North Manhattan.

Chairman GARCIA. You have the Heights?

Mr. VIGNALI. Right; roughly from 138th Street north.

Chairman GARCIA. How are you doing with the Dominicans?

Mr. VIGNALI. I believe we are doing very well. I think we are having a little problem with the southern part of this district, which is North Harlem.

Chairman GARCIA. Is that black?

Mr. VIGNALI. Right.

Chairman GARCIA. But that is pretty mixed throughout 135th Street, along the drive.

Mr. VIGNALI. It is mixed, but it is predominantly black.

I think the blacks generally trust the Government less, although I have covered——

Chairman GARCIA. I think poor people in general have that feeling, I don't think it is a question——

Mr. VIGNALI. The Hispanics aren't too much better off economically.

Of course, I have been told that the word is out on the street that among illegal aliens in the district, if you get counted by the census, you cannot be deported.

I am not exactly sure of the source of that information, but I have been told that.

We do have problems with the personality conflicts in the office.

Chairman GARCIA. That is the first time I heard that; I am still trying to register that last comment.

Go ahead—continue.

Mr. VIGNALI. Well, I spoke at a number of community organizations, and one of the things I pointed out was that if the census information were used for any purpose by the immigration authorities, that that could not be used that way, and the case would be thrown out. I think it could be one possible source for that, but I don't really know.

But there are problems in the office of political push and shove, people flexing with political muscle.

The post office has created a lot of problems.

We have gotten blue cards as recently as a week and a half ago.

They sent us a large number of blue cards and the addresses were already out there.

Some of the blue cards we have returned, when we put those in the mailstream, they came back as no such address, and I don't really know what the post office department is doing, although my father told me before the census was started that we would have trouble with the post office, he is a retired postal employee.

We are having a lot of problems.

In addition to that, I am finding that there is fear in the community. People are perhaps a little more willing to open their door to the people who live in the community, but they are still not willing to open their door to anyone, and the people who work for us are afraid of shooting galleries in these other areas, too.

Chairman GARCIA. I have found that to be the case, not only from the political process when we have to go out and get petitions signed, it has always been a very difficult chore, and we are finding the same thing now. We had hoped that by having local folks count, it would be easier, but they are still encountering a great deal of difficulties in getting people to open their doors.

Mr. VIGNALI. I have personally called several management companies, because they don't want to let the enumerators in, and at least one company I went to the vice president of the company, and I forget how many buildings they have, but they house roughly 500,000 people within the city, and he said that he talked to his lawyers, and they advised him that he was not obligated to give us information, and we would have to get that information on our own.

Chairman GARCIA. That is unfortunate.

Maybe if you could make that name available for the record, maybe somebody on the subcommittee can call.

Of course, what he does not realize is that by decreasing the population, we increase the real estate taxes, and the more real estate taxes that we have, the more he is going to have to end up paying.

So that he has a great deal at stake, and if his lawyer is giving him that advice, they certainly should look closer at it.

Mr. Barnwell.

Mr. BARNWELL. My name is Aubrey Barnwell, and I am the district manager in Brooklyn.

It is a fact that my district, north central Brooklyn is running behind schedule. However, I can assure you that we are doing quality work.

Most of the problems I have been having have already been reiterated here, however, I would like to add a few points.

I have had problems with the postal system.

I have had problems with the reluctance of people to accept jobs with the census because of it affecting welfare benefits, that has been a problem in Bedford Stuyvesant particularly.

The high rate of abandonment, attracting addicts, consequently enumerators are afraid to go out in sections of Brooklyn.

We have an extremely large percentage of undocumented workers.

Chairman GARCIA. Most of those persons who are undocumented, are Haitian for the most part?

Mr. BARNWELL. Not most necessarily Haitian, people from the Caribbean, and from South America also.

Chairman GARCIA. OK, fine.

Mr. BARNWELL. We have had an extremely high enumerator turnover, which was basically due to the fear of the neighborhood, and I can honestly say that we have not been getting the proper support from the local law enforcement authorities.

I have made several complaints myself, and to no avail.

We have had bomb threats, and they have come, looked at the building, and told some of my employees that they would not return.

We had another threat such as that.

My enumerators are being beaten in the streets, and in turn being arrested for protecting themselves.

These are some of the major problems I am having.

If I could get some increased protection from the Police Department, I think it would help tremendously.

Chairman GARCIA. Mr. Hughes.

Mr. HUGHES. My name is James Hughes, and I am the district manager for the northeast Manhattan, which is central Harlem.

Chairman GARCIA. You go from river to river?

Mr. HUGHES. From river to river, from 110th Street to 141st Street.

Chairman GARCIA. For many years, for 13 years I was a State senator, representing everything east of Fifth Avenue, so I know the area well.

Mr. HUGHES. And my response rate presently is between about 63 and 70 percent, which is quite good for that area, because when I think that the reason is—one of the reasons it is probably so good for that area is that the amount of work that was done by the community services people in that area was tremendous.

I can truly say that whenever you go out on the street and talk about the census to Harlemites, that they recognize it quite well because of the work that has been done in that area.

One of the problems that still remains in my area is that now that we've skimmed off all the cream, and got that 70 percent, the 30 percent that remains right now is in places such as drug galleries, where they do drugs, homesteaders, people inside of cemented up buildings, living inside of cemented up buildings. The drug traffic is so thick in some of my areas over there, they even have sophisticated electronic equipment to keep you out of the building.

I have one other problem that I have had in that area, which is getting into buildings that have high security, and I might add very effective security, which does not let us in, under no circumstances, under no circumstances can we get into these places.

In fact, I have an enumerator who was beaten up quite thoroughly by a security officer, and he lived in the building.

So these are the kinds of problems that I am faced with over there.

I did have some problems with in the office, however, those were payroll problems and I do believe that those stem from the person that was in that department, and he had no idea, no concept of how to do the job. But that has been taken care of, and I think everybody in my office right now is being paid in the minimum time, 3 to 4 weeks.

Chairman GARCIA. Thank you all very much.

Just let me say to the four of you here, and to the five who testified before you, that if you should think of other areas with problems on my recommendation—that we can enter into this record, this would be quite helpful. In case you have had any reluctance to say anything here, because it is a public forum, I understand that very well, you can submit to us, anything in writing, and we will enter it into the record.

I just want you to be very comfortable about that, OK?

I say that to you only because I want to make certain that if there is something that you may have forgotten, or you did not get to state at this particular moment, you can get it to us and we will enter exactly what it is that you want to say into the record.

I think we all have a public responsibility because whatever we are doing now, we are going to make it a little easier in the next time around.

Mr. HUGHES. May I also add one other point?

I wanted to also address the vacancy problem.

Now, as I understand it, I think the vacancy rate for all of Manhattan is supposed to be about 3 percent. I believe that I have that much in Harlem.

Chairman GARCIA. Sure, I don't doubt that at all.

I am aware of blocks around 115th, 116th Street that are vacant between that strip all the way up to 125th.

I know it well.

The same thing with the Bronx, Harlem, and Brooklyn, is very much a part of that, too.

OK Mr. Depesa.

Mr. DEPESA. Before I begin. I would like to say that I object to the fact that in the limited time that we had here, the Census Bureau stacked the deck with a bunch of people who will not give the facts about the Census Bureau.

Not one person here has come up with a Census Bureau procedure that they found faulty.

All of the problems they have encountered, they are saying the people of their area have created.

They have not pointed out one procedure that is bad, and there are many, I would like to bring up some of them.

Mr. Landron was speaking, he said he was giving all the importance to the crew leader job, and it is the main job in the Bureau.

During the week of the transit strike, I trained crew leaders, the whole week that there was no transit available, I was giving training for 4 days.

After the fourth day I realized that I was going to be behind schedule because we were starting late, people were walking there, and we had difficulty starting, and I realized we would have trouble finishing in time.

Rather than pay 4 hours overtime to everybody, get the job done right, they told me to cut corners and skip half the stuff that was left.

This is the attitude of the Census Bureau.

They are not here to count people, they are here to go through their procedures, and get the job done according to their procedures, and then go home.

They couldn't care less about how many people we count, as long as they get their job done according to their procedures.

Some of their procedures are very messed up.

I would like to get into some of them.

We have heard a lot of talk about the precanvass registers. Now, in Congressman Garcia's district, we had no quality control over these registers.

The registers were given out to people, and they were going to go out and check them. We also had these other people called Q.C. enumerators to go out and check the work of the precanvass enumerators to make sure they were doing their job.

There was no quality control in your district, and they haven't done anything to fix it yet.

The enumerator assignments were given out in the wrong order, and the Q.C. enumerator was never able to pick up on their work, it was impossible, because of the mistakes that they made in giving out the enumerator assignments.

They gave those assignments to Bill and Bill's assignment to Tom, and they messed it all up, and they have done nothing to collect it yet.

One of the main problems we had in our district was recruiting.

We didn't have enough people to fill the workload that we thought we had.

One of the problems was that they had—we had 120,000 estimated units in our district.

Out of 120,000, about 40,000 were vacant units.

So it looked like we had a lot more work than we did, because a vacant unit, you go to the building, and there will be 20 apartments in that building, and the building is gone.

You don't have to go into the building, if it is gone.

So they inflated the workloads, so that instead of hiring 400 people to work for a month to do a job, this is what they would do, they would hire 450 people to do the operation, they could have done it with 200 people, with less people, and just let them work a little longer and get the whole job done completely.

They did not do this.

They would go through the procedures and say we would need 400 people.

The buildings didn't exist, we would hire people to go out and do a job, and it was useless. We were training people for nothing. I was in

charge of training and I constantly suggested why can't we extend the training from 2 days to 3 days.

Instead of working 8 hours a day, 2 days of training, give them 5 hours Monday, 5 hours the next day, and 6 hours the next day. Give them time to go home and study their manuals and do it right.

I was fired right after making that suggestion.

This has nothing to do with anything.

They don't want to change any of their procedures.

One of the procedures they have at the Bureau, or one of the things they will constantly talk about is uniformity.

When you talk to the RCC, and you tell them you have a special problem in the district, they tell you that we cannot do anything different in your district because the rest of the country is doing it this way, what makes you so special.

Some of the problems with uniformity are that the South Bronx got 200 Spanish-speaking questionnaires and so did Juneau, Alaska, where there are probably no Hispanics at all.

Chairman GARCIA. What was that now?

Mr. DEPESA. We got 200 Spanish-language questionnaires to send out, and so did an office in Alaska, or one in Kansas, where there are no Hispanics at all, this is what uniformity is.

Chairman GARCIA. Excuse me, Mr. Hill, would you care to respond to that?

Mr. HILL. If you will include that as a written question, like you mentioned to me before, I will give you a full rundown on how many kits we had, and what we had, and what problems we had, and how we moved what we had around.

I am a little confused about that now. I will be glad to give you all the information necessary.

Mr. DEPESA. I had a problem with equal training.

If everybody in the country gets the same training, you are saying that everybody is starting from equal, they are all of equal intelligence.

The fact of the matter is that the average reading grade of a person graduating from New York City is eighth, it is around an eighth-grade level.

The Census Bureau is hiring people and you don't need a diploma if you are over 18. The average goes down when you add in the facts that a lot of people took jobs when they cannot read above an eighth-grade level.

So the average reading level of our work force is probably less than eighth grade, and I had problems reading some of the procedures in these manuals, some of them were so botched up and confusing, you couldn't tell what you were reading.

They were just ambiguous, and didn't help the kids at all.

It just confused them more.

They gave the same training to our students as they did to kids in California, or up in Scarsdale, N.Y., they gave the same training, and they didn't start equally.

Some had less education or less intelligence and they got the same kind of training, and nothing was done to make it better for people in the South Bronx and in other areas.

The Census Bureau has a thing called the suppressed unit list, and this is a list of addresses that it holds back from their precanvass regis-

ter. They give the registers to people, and they send them out to make sure they go to these people, and there is a suppressed unit list, and they send these Q.C. enumerators to these places to make sure that the first guy did his job, and went to this address. The suppressed unit list was about 10 years old. There were so many addresses on the quality control list that didn't exist any more.

So we had enumerators where you might have to go to 20 apartments to see who was there, and out of those 20 apartments, 15 of those apartments could have been burnt out.

So now the enumerator only has to go to 5, and he has only checked up on 5 apartments, whereas before he was checked up on all 20.

So like if a disproportionate amount of apartments are burned out, the quality goes down, and there is no adjustment to this. They could have taken this list of suppressed units, gone out and checked it, and made sure all of these buildings existed, that people live here.

They have a whole list of places where people live. Then they give the enumerators their work load, and let them go out and they could check it up.

Why put on the suppressed unit list buildings that don't exist?

If the enumerator fails to pick up a suppressed unit, if he goes to a building and doesn't find the unit that they suppressed, that they did not put on that list, if he leaves out two, he fails, his book fails, and the book is redone.

If all the apartments in this building are burned out, and there is just one building left there, he just goes to one building. It is hard to explain. He will have a workload to go to. He will go there.

We have blocks where 80 percent of the apartments had people living in them, and 20 percent didn't. The quality is affected if the O.C. list is not adjusted, because the enumerator will go to a place, and they will find 8 apartments there where they should have found 10.

We know there is 10, and they only listed 8. So we know they didn't go to two apartments.

They probably did not do their work.

So the suppressed unit list should have been adjusted to make up for this.

The enumerator could fill the book, he could have one building on his whole register. He didn't have to go to that building at all, if it is the only building that existed, and that book would pass quality control.

Chairman GARCIA. I hear you.

Mr. DEPESA. There is no quality control in the district, because there are so many burned down buildings, a disproportionate amount of units could be on the suppressed-units list, and you will have no quality at all.

We told them about this, and they made no adjustments to it.

Another thing about uniformity.

We found out in the first week when we were working, before precanvass, that many apartments in the Bronx, don't have apartment designations. The mailboxes just have names on them.

There will be 10 mailboxes, and it will have Jones, Smith, and all of that.

The questionnaires are mailed out to apartment designations, and not to people. So that the post office, the mailman, he has to figure out

from an apartment designation on this questionnaire which goes to which.

There will be 10 mailboxes, and it will have Jones, Smith, and all of that.

The questionnaires are mailed out to apartment designations, and not to people. So that the post office, the mailman, he has to figure out from an apartment designation on this questionnaire which goes to which.

There is no way of doing it.

There is no apartment designation on the door, and none on the mailbox.

Another thing with the post office, many apartments in the Bronx, the mailboxes are broken, or they don't have them anymore.

The people go to the post office to pick up their mail.

The post office has a section called the broken box section, where people go there every day and they get their mail.

The Census Bureau did not allow for these people to get counted.

What they did was instead of sending questionnaires into those boxes, where the people get their mail everyday, the Census Bureau instructed the post office to put the questionnaires directly into the broken mailboxes. They are going every day to the post office, but this day they have to figure out, with no one telling them, that they have to go to their broken mailbox to get their mail, it is not going to work that way.

This is in thousands of cases in the South Bronx.

Nothing was done about the big questionnaire.

Many mailboxes are too small for the questionnaires, they are too big.

What did they ever do to make sure that the postman got these questionnaires to people?

They just threw them in the lobby, that was their procedure.

Uniformity.

Another thing, no intent was made to alleviate the problem of poor recruitment in the E.D.'s. This is what I was talking about before. They only had 90,000 apartments for people living in them in our district.

So we sent out a 130,000 questionnaires to all of these people, and we got them all back.

Many of them had no people living in these apartments, they were burnt out, or they were vacant apartments, and the problems that we had physically dealt with the post office definition and the Census Bureau's definition of what is a nonexistent or a vacant apartment, and these definitions are different.

The post office counts you as a vacant or nonexistent apartment if they don't deliver to you anymore, whereas we know if the people live in the building, it is not vacant.

The post office, they didn't care.

If they don't deliver there anymore, that means nobody lives there. That is why we have problems with the post office.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me say this, because I have a meeting to go to.

You have some notes there. Here is what I want you to do for us, for the subcommittee. What I would like you to do is give us that full report as you have written it, and send it to the subcommittee. I am

going to take what you have, and enter everything that you have said in it's entirety into this record of today.

I would appreciate very much, Frank, if right now, you could take another minute or two and sum up.

Mr. DEPESA. OK.

Chairman GARCIA. One last point, Frank, we will follow up on every one of those charges.

Mr. DEPESA. OK.

The major problem I had was with training; it only affected quality. You can train everybody the same way, but if they are not starting from the same point, it is not of any help. They don't even care.

Chairman GARCIA. I think the best point you made was that, if you are going to give a 2-day training session to somebody in the east side of Manhattan, and the same 2-day session for somebody in Scarsdale, and a 2-day session for somebody in the South Bronx, obviously there is a problem.

Mr. DEPESA. I suggested that they extend the training, and they told me that it would cost too much to pay the people to do the training. They told me this during the transit strike.

We cannot afford to pay for all of these expenses to have people come down here for 3 days rather than 2. There were no trains anyway, the people were walking down. That is the way it existed.

The Bureau doesn't want people to question its procedures. They want a bunch of people to work for them, who either go by their books and procedures, to get the job done, which is all they are concerned with. They are only concerned with doing it their way, whether the procedure is bad or good, it doesn't matter. They don't care. They are not looking to count people. They are looking to follow their procedures.

That is all they do.

The best D.M. in this office is the man that goes by procedure, not the man who counts the most people. It doesn't matter to them.

How many district managers, Mr. Hill, were fired, that is, people from Washington? How many people from Washington have lost their jobs since the Bureau came to New York?

Mr. HILL. I cannot discuss individual personnel problems with anyone in the public forum.

Mr. DEPESA. You can guess, there are probably none.

The attrition rate for enumerators is over 50 percent, and for crewleaders it is 40 percent, but D.M.'s from Washington, they all have jobs.

Mr. MASSILION. May I have 15 seconds?

Everyone must pass the test to work for the Census Bureau whether they are from east New York or the Bronx, all of them start out the same place.

Chairman GARCIA. Let me take this opportunity to thank all of you. We will probably be holding another hearing in the city of New York again within the next 2 months to pick up on some of the matters that have been discussed here today, to find out where we have been, and where we are going.

I just feel that I have a tremendous responsibility to the city, and I want to make sure that it is fulfilled.

I thank each and every one of you for being with us today, and as soon as the record of this hearing is put together, you will all get a copy, if you so request.

[Whereupon, at 2:30 p.m., this hearing adjourned.]

[The following letter was received in response to subcommittee questions:]

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Bureau of the Census,
Washington, D.C., September 23, 1980.

Hon. ROBERT GARCIA,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Census and Population, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: This is in further response to your letter of June 13 in which you forwarded further questions on the 1980 census as a followup to the Subcommittee field hearing on June 7 in New York City.

As I mentioned in my initial response to your letter, these questions arrived at the peak of census work and I was reluctant to divert resources from these important operations to compile the material for the answers to your questions. I hope this delay has not caused you an inconvenience.

If we may be of further assistance, please let us know.

Sincerely,

VINCENT P. BARABBA,
Director, Bureau of the Census.

Enclosures.

1. How many forms were mailed citywide and for each Census District within the city?

District office number and name:	*Total adjusted mailout (housing units)* [1]
2201—Staten Island	265,195
2202—Northeast Queens	279,170
2203—Northwest Queens	277,410
2240—North Manhattan	124,901
2241—Northeast Manhattan	111,936
2242—East Manhattan	264,481
2243—South Manhattan	170,392
2244—West Manhattan	161,739
2245—South Bronx	111,479
2246—East Bronx	155,620
2247—Northwest Bronx	153,253
2248—Southwest Bronx	136,497
2249—Northwest Queens	132,824
2250—Southeast Queens	102,301
2251—Northwest Brooklyn	141,497
2252—North Central Brooklyn	114,013
2253—Northeast Brooklyn	128,193
2254—Central Brooklyn	138,189
2255—South Brooklyn	167,274
2256—Southeast Brooklyn	146,386
Total	3,282,750

[1] Adjusted mailout is all forms distributed to the post office for delivery, less those returned by the post office as undeliverable.

2. What was the total number of census forms returned for the entire city?

District office number and name:	Mail returns (housing units)
2201—Staten Island	193,107
2202—Northeast Queens	196,689
2203—West Queens	202,011
2240—North Manhattan	88,790
2241—Northeast Manhattan	49,525
2242—East Manhattan	173,999
2243—South Manhattan	106,374
2244—West Manhattan	105,810
2245—South Bronx	48,781
2246—East Bronx	124,200
2247—Northwest Bronx	91,044
2248—Southwest Bronx	56,663
2249—Northwest Queens	85,320
2250—Southeast Queens	61,796
2251—Northwest Brooklyn	89,795
2252—North Central Brooklyn	47,677
2253—Northeast Brooklyn	69,535
2254—Central Brooklyn	81,181
2255—South Brooklyn	117,418
2256—Southeast Brooklyn	83,098
Total	2,067,863

3. The response rates were for occupied units. Did the Bureau derive a vacancy rate for each district office? How was this computer, and how did the Census Bureau know which units were vacant?

The Bureau did not derive a vacancy rate for each district office. For budget planning, the figures by borough for the 1978 New York City Vacancy Survey were applied to the respective district offices. Questionnaires returned by the Post Office as vacant were left on the mailing list and assigned as part of Followup 1 so that an enumerator could determine the actual status by a personal visit.

4. What happened when a form was returned to a district office by the Postal Service because it was "undeliverable?"

It was assigned to Followup 1.

Were the "undeliverables" counted as returned mail or were they subtracted from the total mail-out?

Neither.

Will the Bureau follow-up on each undeliverable form?

Yes.

5. What was the follow-up 1 workload citywide, and by district office?

District office and name:	Followup 1 workload (housing units) [1]
2201—Staten Island	66,794
2202—Northeast Queens	68,095
2203—West Queens	65,207
2240—North Manhattan	37,519
2241—Northeast Manhattan	45,498
2242—East Manhattan	74,344
2243—South Manhattan	53,015
2244—West Manhattan	59,859
2245—South Bronx	33,844
2246—East Bronx	35,239
2247—Northwest Bronx	46,329
2248—Southwest Bronx	41,797
2249—Northwest Queens	51,418
2250—Southeast Queens	41,675
2251—Northwest Brooklyn	49,431
2252—North Central Brooklyn	51,049
2253—Northeast Brooklyn	41,940
2254—Central Brooklyn	71,140
2255—South Brooklyn	43,100
2256—Southeast Brooklyn	47,886
Total	1,020,179

[1] Followup 1 Workload: This figure is calculated by taking the Followup Workload Report and substracting the nixies and duplicates (reported in the Census Mailing List Improvements Report) and late mail returns (as described earlier).

6. If someone returned a form with the box checked off requesting a Spanish language questionnaire, was this form counted as a return?

No, not until the Spanish questionnaire is returned by the requester.

7. How do we really know from a quantitative standpoint that each and every New York household received a census form?

There is no way to know from a quantitative standpoint that every household received a questionnaire. We do know that ever housing unit on the mailing list must be accounted for either through a mail return or a personal visit by the enumerator.

8. What is the Bureau's best guess of the number of households that were left off the address register?

The Bureau of the Census has no way of estimating the number of households that might have been left off the address register. However, we will estimate the number of housing units missed in the census as part of the evaluation program. Our best guess at this point is that it is probably quite low.

9. How great is the potential for missing these households even after the follow-up?

Our 1970 and pretest experiences indicate that the potential is very low.

10. Will the Bureau cutback any part of the decennial census as a result of budget reductions? If so, in what areas and with what impact on coverage in New York?

It is not the Bureau's intention to cut back on any procedures that will impact on coverage in New York.

11. How far behind schedule is the decennial count in New York?

The New York City district offices are approximately 1 to 1½ months behind schedule. However, New York City, based on experience in past censuses, was recognized in our planning as one of, if not the most difficult, areas to enumerate. It was expected, therefore, that census activities in New York City would be somewhat behind other cities.

12. What additional costs will be incurred as a result?

The overall cost of taking the census nationally is greater than expected. It is not possible to state that the cost of taking the census in New York City contributed disproportionately to that increase.

13. Because of pressure to keep down census expenditures, the Census Bureau apparently intends to modify follow-up 2. Please explain and contrast what follow-up 2 was originally planned to accomplish.

Followup 2 was originally designed to find additional population, additional housing units, and to follow up on questionnaires with incomplete answers. Oper-

ations relating to the completeness of answers were modified but not activities relating to coverage (the count). Modifications to Followup 2 eliminated followup at any addresses where characteristic data were incomplete. Office procedures were modified to reduce the level of quality control on the enumerators work. Procedures designed to improve population and housing counts were not affected.

14. When are New York District Offices scheduled to close? What will trigger an office closing?

New York offices are scheduled to close from mid-September to mid-October. The closing of an office will be triggered by completion of all work and the keying of all counts.

15. What does it mean when a returned form fails edit?

It means that additional work is needed on the questionnaire before it is considered "acceptable."

16. How many items and which ones must be left unanswered on either forms before a form fails edit?

Both short- and long-form questionnaires contain a set of questions intended to improve the "coverage" of persons and dwellings in the census. These "coverage" questions are questions 1, H1, H2, H3, and H4. If the response to any one of them indicates that one or more persons or dwellings may have been missed, the entire questionnaire fails edit—regardless of the number of unanswered questions. If a questionnaire passes all coverage edits, it will still fail edit if it is a short form and has four or more unanswered questions or is a long form and has 20 or more unanswered questions. Each part of a question is counted as a single question, so that unanswered question 24a, b, c, d, e, and f would be counted as six unanswered questions.

Has the number of items been increased recently? If so, which ones and why?

Some modifications were recently made to the edit rules to reduce the failed-edit workload, inasmuch as the actual failed-edit rate in the census was considerably higher than anticipated and budgeted for. The primary change was the increase from 10 to 20 of the number of unanswered questions necessary on a long-form questionnaire to cause it to fail edit. The effect on the quality of the data is expected to be minimal. It should be noted that many questions have numerous parts, all of which are considered as individual questions; for example, the income question contains eight parts. The short-form tolerance was not changed. A second modifications involved questions H1, H2, and H3. If there is a positive response to any of these questions indicating that a person was missed or counted in error, the questionnaire will automatically fail edit. A "Yes" answer or the name of person written in is considered a positive response. If the question is unanswered it will be counted as only one unanswered question and will not be sufficient by itself to cause the questionnaire to fail edit. Formerly, unanswered questions H1, H2, or H3 were sufficient to cause edit failure.

This change was made because it was observed that a large number of questionnaires were failing edit only because of unanswered questions H1, H2, and H3 and it was felt that these questions were unanswered because the respondents regarded them as not applicable and failed to answer rather than marking them "No."

17. The Bureau announced earlier that it intended to followup on each household reported as vacant. Is that still the situation? If not, why the change? What do we suffer in terms of accuracy?

The Bureau still intends to follow up on each housing unit reported as vacant.

18. Does the Bureau follow up on each piece of missing information? If not, then how does the Bureau make up for this lost information? How accurate is this imputed or created data?

The Census Bureau does not follow up for each piece of missing information. To make the most efficient use of limited resources for followup, questionnaires are segregated into two groups: (1) Those with several pieces of missing information, and (2) those with only a few missing pieces of information. The former are sent for followup to try to collect the additional information, while the latter are accepted without additional attempts at followup.

After the field operations are concluded and the district office is closed, the questionnaires are sent to a processing center where the data on the questionnaires are placed on computer tape. Since 1950, the Census Bureau has used the computer as a tool in allocating missing information. Instead of having a "nonresponse category" in its publications, the Census Bureau distributes the nonresponse to enhance the quality of the data. Computer programs are designed to

allocate for missing pieces of information. These allocation procedures are designed to assign a value for the missing data item based on the characteristics for another person or household with similar reported characteristics.

The accuracy of the allocated data is dependent upon the degree to which the characteristics included in each allocation matrix classify the population into homogenous subgroups for the variable being allocated. In our opinion, the allocation schemes used are generally superior to leaving the entries blanks, or to the use of less complex approaches.

For users of printed census reports, there will be several tables which show allocation rates and distributions of data before and after allocation. Similarly users of summary tapes are also informed of allocation rates for data items.

19. What does the failed edit rate tell you about the public's response? If "x" percent of the returned forms were incomplete or otherwise missing data, what percentage of the returned forms were "clean" and required no follow-up?

The failed-edit rate indicates the level of acceptability of the questionnaires completed by respondents.

If "x" percent of the questionnaires were incomplete, the percentage of returned forms that required no followup is somewhat greater than "100–x" percent inasmuch as those short forms with 1–3 unanswered questions and those long forms with 1–19 unanswered questions, while not perfect, were not to be followed up.

20. What is the turnover rate for census workers by position for New York? What are the major causes?

As of July 30, the turnover rates in the New York Region were as follows:

	Hired	Lost	Percent
District manager	[1] 21	0	0
Assistant district office manager	14	5	36
Field operations assistant, E	57	2	10
Field operations supervisor	14	3	21
Office operations supervisor	35	12	34
Administrative operations supervisor	16	4	25
Field operations assistant, P	18	5	28
District manager's clerk	35	12	34
Senior office clerk	13	4	31
Assistant district office manager's clerk	28	10	36
Other clerical	35	20	57
Office operations assistant	35	18	51
Total	469	220	47

[1] From HO's.

Major causes: Personal reasons; found more permanent position; terminated for poor performance (64 employees, or 28 percent of employees lost of 13.3 percent of total hired).

Turnover rates for intermittent employees: Hired, 34,000; number of positions, 16,000; turnover rate, 116 percent.

Causes: There is no formal program to obtain the reasons for these people who have terminated. Informal feedback indicates most people quit to find permanent job.

21. To what extent does an individual's pay level impact on the turnover rate?

There are no data available which indicate that the pay level is a major factor affecting the turnover rate. Of the numerous letters and telephone calls we have received from employees and ex-employees, an insignificant number mention the pay level as being too low.

22. Is the piece rate method of pay adequate or does it in the long run impair the Census Bureau's ability to retain staff?

Piece rates are determined to yield substantially higher hourly pay than the minimum wage for those employees who perform satisfactorily. We have no evidence that the piece-rate method of pay adversely affects our ability to retain staff.

Have any New York offices been authorized to pay the minimum wage?

New York offices have not been authorized to pay the minimum wage per se, but many assignments have been converted to hourly rate.

23. We have heard that the Bureau is contemplating making changes in its recanvassing procedures, please explain the details and the reasons underlying the changes.

There have been no changes in the recanvassing procedures.

24. Will there be any more advertising on TV or radio in New York? Why or why not?

There is no further advertising contemplated after the "Were You Counted" campaign, unless further need develops in the recruiting area.

25. When will local review commence? Will NYC be given more than 10 days to review the numbers?

Local review in New York City commenced the week of July 21–25 and will continue on a flow basis in the various district offices. Because counts are submitted to the City on a flow basis, the total time period for the city to review the data for the City will be far in excess of 10 days. However, we would hope that the city will respond as quickly as possible as the counts from each district office are submitted.

26. We are hearing from many cities that the quality of the local review maps are poor. Apparently, the Bureau's maps are smudged; they're missing streets, etc. It seems the Bureau has not improved the maps since precanvass. Why not and what is the situation in New York?

The Metropolitan Map Series was frozen as of October 1, 1978, in order to allow time to prepare the maps for precanvass. Precanvass enumerators did update the ED maps during precanvass but these additions are not reflected on the local review maps furnished to the cities. Local officials are able to look at the updated maps in the district offices, and we are resupplying "cleaner" copies of the maps where requested. The additions and corrections on the "working maps" will be reflected in the publication maps.

27. Has the Census Bureau conducted any studies to determine the prevalence of curbstoning?

The Bureau has not compiled a summary report on the incidence of curbstoning. This matter was handled within individual district offices under guidance from the regional census centers and consistent with procedures established by headquarters.

28. What areas have the highest incidence of curbstoning?

See answer to question 27.

29. What are the primary reasons for curbstoning?

We assume the same as for other undesirable actions, such as lying, cheating on exams, etc.

30. What is the quality of the work performed by the enumerators?

It is difficult to make an assessment at this time of the quality of the enumerator's work. However, we have instituted a number of new procedures aimed at simplifying the enumerator's tasks and making the enumeration process more efficient.

31. Is enumerator productivity higher or lower than the dress rehearsal? What are the reasons?

Enumerator productivity appears to be somewhat lower in the census itself than in the dress rehearsal. However, the rates are actually not comparable since the rate for dress rehearsal productivity was based on the actual hours worked by an enumerator, while for the 1980 census it assumes an enumerator works 40 hours a week, even though we know that often is not the case.

○